

REPORT
UPON
THE SWEATING SYSTEM
IN
CANADA

PRINTED BY ORDER OF PARLIAMENT



OTTAWA
PRINTED BY S. E. DAWSON, PRINTER TO THE QUEEN'S MOST
EXCELLENT MAJESTY
1896

2

V

T

it
o

t
C
r

s
i
s
c
i

r
c
s
i
c

REPORT

UPON

THE SWEATING SYSTEM IN CANADA

[61]

COMMISSION

Appointing ALEXANDER WHYTE WRIGHT, Esquire, a Commissioner to inquire whether, and if so, to what extent the sweating system is practised in the various industrial centres of the Dominion, and for other purposes. Dated 29th October, 1895. Recorded 6th November, 1895. L. A. CATELLIER, Deputy Registrar General of Canada.

CANADA.

HENRY STRONG, *Deputy Governor.*

VICTORIA, by the Grace of God, of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, Queen, Defender of the Faith, &c., &c., &c.

To ALEXANDER WHYTE WRIGHT, of the Town of Niagara, in the Province of Ontario, in Our Dominion of Canada, and to all to whom the same may come,—GREETING :

Whereas a resolution was adopted by the Dominion Trades and Labour Congress at its recent meeting in the City of London in the Province of Ontario, held in the month of September last past, in the following terms :

“ In consideration of the petition of the Toronto Garment Workers, in reference to the sweating system in Toronto and Montreal, we deem it of urgent necessity that a Commission be appointed to investigate to what extent the system is practised in Toronto, Hamilton and Montreal, as a test of the whole Dominion.”

And whereas it is deemed expedient to investigate into the matter referred to in the said resolution, and to inquire whether, and if so, to what extent the sweating system is practised in the various industrial centres of the Dominion of Canada, and at the same time to procure information respecting the kindred question of wages and any other matters affecting the employment and conditions of life and labour among the industrial classes—

Now Know Ye that, by and with the advice of Our Privy Council for Canada, We, reposing trust and confidence in your loyalty, integrity and ability, have nominated, constituted and appointed, and do hereby nominate, constitute and appoint you, the said Alexander Whyte Wright, to be Our Commissioner for the purpose of investigating into the matter referred to in the said resolution before mentioned, and to inquire whether, and if so, to what extent the sweating system is practised in the various industrial centres of the Dominion, and at the same time to procure information respecting the kindred question of wages and any other matters affecting the employment and conditions of life and labour among the industrial classes, and We do, under and by virtue of the powers vested in Us by Chapter 114 of the Revised Statutes of Canada,

intituled "An Act respecting inquiries concerning public matters," and by and with the like advice confer upon you as such Commissioner the power of summoning before you any witnesses, and of requiring them to produce such documents and things as you, Our said Commissioner, shall deem requisite to the full investigation of the matters into which you are hereby appointed to examine.

To have, hold, exercise and enjoy the said office, place and trust unto you, the said Alexander Whyte Wright, together with the rights, powers, privileges and emoluments unto the said office, place and trust of right and by law appertaining during pleasure.

And we do hereby require and direct you to report to our Secretary of State of Canada the result of your investigations, together with the evidence taken before you and any opinion or remarks you may see fit to make thereon.

In Testimony whereof we have caused these Our Letters to be made Patent, and the Great Seal of Canada to be hereunto affixed. Witness the Honourable Sir Henry Strong, Knight, Deputy of our Right Trusty and Right Well beloved Cousin and Councillor the Right Honourable Sir John Campbell Hamilton Gordon, Earl of Aberdeen, Viscount Formartine, Baron Haddo, Methlic, Traves and Kellie, in the Peerage of Scotland, Viscount Gordon of Aberdeen, County of Aberdeen, in the Peerage of the United Kingdom, Baronet of Nova Scotia, Knight Grand Cross of Our Most Distinguished Order of Saint Michael and Saint George, etc., etc., Governor General of Canada.

At Our Government House, in Our City of Ottawa, this Twenty-ninth day of October, in the year of Our Lord one thousand eight hundred and ninety-five, and in the Fifty-ninth year of Our Reign.

By Command.

L. A. CATELLIER,

Under Secretary of State.

E. L. NEWCOMBE,
Deputy Minister of Justice.

To the Honourable Sir CHARLES TUPPER, Bart., G.C.M.G., C.B.,
Secretary of State.

SIR,—As commanded in the Commission under the Great Seal, bearing date the 29th day of October last past, appointing me a Commissioner "to inquire whether, and if so, to what extent the sweating system is practised in the various industrial centres of the Dominion, and at the same time to procure information respecting the kindred question of wages and other matters affecting the employment and conditions of life and labour among the industrial classes" I beg leave to submit to you my report.

Inasmuch as the time allowed me for the completion of my investigation, as stated in the letter from your department which accompanied my commission, was limited to ninety days, I deemed it inadvisable either to attempt to make an exhaustive investigation of all shops and other places which might be considered as being embraced within the scope of my inquiry, or to endeavour to ascertain, except in a general way, the rates of wages paid. Even had my time been unlimited, it is doubtful whether detailed and accurate statistical information, of the kind last referred to, could be obtained by a temporary commission. Information concerning the wages paid and the conditions of labour found to obtain in a few establishments could not be depended upon to indicate, with any degree of accuracy, what the general conditions or wages might be. The publication of incomplete information might result in serious wrong either to those whose establishments were reported upon or to their competitors in business. I visited large numbers of factories, workshops and dwellings in which work was being carried on, conversing both with employers and employees, but though I gathered, in this way,

a great deal of information bearing upon the matters under investigation, I have not deemed it expedient to mention names in this report; indeed I found it necessary in several instances to give an assurance that no names would be made public, in order to obtain information.

To avoid danger of misapprehension it may be as well to state here that I have not attempted to define the meaning of the term "Sweating system." Even among those who have made a special study of questions affecting labour and the labouring classes, there are widely varying opinions as to the meaning of the much used term, the differing definitions being almost as numerous as the men who give them. It has been defined as "the system of making clothing under filthy and inhuman conditions"; as "work sent out by a first contractor to be done in tenement houses or in the homes of the operatives"; as "a combination of the tenement house system, the sub-contract system and the task system"; as "wherever men are employed at low wages and under unhealthy conditions"; as "grinding the faces of the poor," etc., etc. As a matter of fact there is not in any country, certainly not in Canada, any system coextensive with the popular use of the term "sweating system." The words have really no definite meaning, for there are no conditions found in all the cases in which the term is applied, which are not also to be found in numerous other cases to which it is not applied. The confusion arising from the differing meanings which each witness attached to the term, appears to have been, in no small degree, responsible for the apparently rambling nature of the answers given to the upwards of thirty-two thousand questions, put by the Commission of the British House of Lords, to the witnesses who appeared before it. Realizing that any attempt on my part to act upon an arbitrary definition of the term "sweating system" would only hinder the inquiry, I have avoided this and conducted the investigation on more general grounds. For this reason whenever in this report the words are used they are not to be understood as having a definite meaning.

In Great Britain there are a considerable number of trades in which the "sweating system" obtains. Besides the clothing trade, the distress in which was the immediate occasion of the appointment of the Lords' Commission, the chain and nail trade, the nut and bolt trade, the boot trade and the cabinet making industry are all in a greater or lesser degree organized on the contract and sub-contract plan. In the United States the system is not so widely distributed and is confined to the various branches of the clothing trade, the making up of fur and feather goods and the manufacture of cigars and cigarettes. The excise laws of the Dominion effectually prevent the introduction of the "sweating system" into the cigar industry in Canada, but the conditions obtaining in the clothing and fur trades and in making of shirts, neckties and some other goods are so similar here and in the republic that it would be natural to expect that like methods of manufacture would prevail. I have considered it advisable, therefore, having regard to the limited time at my disposal, and believing that I would thus be making my inquiries in the quarter in which information would be most likely to be obtainable, to confine my investigation to the industries mentioned.

I directed my efforts to obtaining information under the following heads:—

1. Do the several manufacturing concerns manufacture their goods in factories of their own; give them out to contractors who have shops and employ workmen; or do they give them out directly to people who make them up in their own homes?
2. In those establishments in which more than one of these systems prevail, under which of them is the greater part of the work done?
3. Do manufacturers get their work done more cheaply or better by giving it out to contractors than they do when they have factories of their own?
4. When the work is given out either to contractors or to people who work at home, is there usually an agreement as to the prices to be paid—e.g., an agreement covering a period of time—or is the price fixed at the time the goods are given out; and, if the latter, is the fixing of the price deputed to some foreman or employee?
5. Have manufacturers any agreement or understanding with each other as to the prices they will pay for the making of goods they give out to contractors, or as to the wages they will pay in their factories?

6. Do manufacturers pay the same prices for similar work to contractors who have shops as they do to people who take work to be done in their own homes?

7. Do manufacturers make any effort to keep themselves informed as to the wages paid by contractors who take work from them?

8. Are there any organizations or combinations among the contractors whose object is to fix or regulate the prices at which work will be taken by them from wholesale manufacturers; or for the purpose of controlling the wages or prices for piece work to be paid to their own employees?

9. What are the sanitary conditions of the shops in which goods are made up under contract? Do the manufacturers make any effort to inform themselves as to this?

10. To what extent, if at all, does the practice prevail among contractors of using the shops or rooms in which they work as sleeping rooms for their families?

11. Have infectious diseases been spread by means of garments made in contractors' shops or private houses?

12. To what extent does the sub-contracting system prevail?

13. Does the contract system obtain to any extent in the custom or ordered clothing trade, or is it confined to the ready-made clothing business?

14. Do custom or merchant tailors generally have workshops on their premises, or do their employees take work home to be there made up with the assistance of their families?

15. Does the contract system result in reducing wages and in lowering the conditions of labour?

16. Are there many shops or places, in which manufacturing is carried on, which do not come under the provisions of the Factories Acts, because of not having the requisite number of employees?

17. Is it the practice to employ in such shops or places children who are under the factories age; and do women and children, employed in such shops or places, work more hours per day or week than is permitted under the Factories Acts?

18. In such shops or places are the conditions often or usually unsanitary?

19. Are the larger shops, by reason of having to comply with the provisions of the Factories Acts, placed at a disadvantage as compared with such smaller shops or places?

20. Are the provisions of the Factories Acts satisfactorily enforced and do the Acts give general satisfaction in their working?

21. Are the provisions of the Acts sufficiently comprehensive to ensure effectual inspection and regulation of all shops and places where the contract or "sweating system" might be carried on?

22. Is it believed that, by reason of their having to comply with the provisions of the Factories Acts, employers in the provinces in which such acts are in force are placed at a disadvantage as compared with employers in other provinces?

23. If stringent laws were enacted in any one province to prevent or suppress the "sweating system" would such legislation be likely to transfer the trade to other provinces?

24. If stringent Dominion legislation were enacted for this purpose would it be likely to transfer the business to other countries?

25. If for the purpose of preventing or suppressing the "sweating system" legislation were enacted requiring that clothing should be labelled or ticketed to show whether it was made in a factory, a contractor's shop or a dwelling, would such legislation have the effect intended and would it be prejudicial to business or otherwise?

26. Would it be practical and useful to require that a license should be taken out by the owner of each factory, shop or other place where clothing or other goods is made under contract, for the purpose of ensuring proper supervision and inspection?

27. Is the tendency, judged by the experience of recent years, toward a higher or lower rate of wages?

28. In such trades or divisions of trades as show a tendency toward higher wages does the tendency appear to be due to combinations among the workmen, to better prices for the finished goods, to a scarcity of competent workmen, or is it to be accounted for in any other way?

29. Where wages or prices for making have fallen, or show a tendency to fall, has this been, or is it due to competition among contractors or workmen, to reduced prices for the finished goods, to the use of improved machinery and appliances, to division and organization of labour, to combinations among employers, or to any other specific reason or reasons?

30. Have wages been affected by immigration or by the bringing in of workmen from foreign countries by employers, under contracts made abroad?

31. To what extent does the apprenticeship system prevail, and in what degree are wages affected by it?

32. In shops or factories does the piece work system generally prevail or are the employees generally paid by the day or week: and if the latter, is it usual to fix a stint or task as a day's work?

33. Does the piece work system prevail more generally among male or female employees?

34. Leaving children out of the calculation do piece hands or day hands, as a rule, receive the higher wages?

35. How many hours, generally, constitute a day's work?

36. Does the system of fining for imperfect or partially spoiled work prevail to any extent?

37. Are there a greater or lesser number of idle men in the trade now than formerly; that is in recent years, and if the number is greater, has this been due to a decrease in the demand for goods, to improved machinery or changed methods of manufacture, or to the number of workers in the trade having increased more rapidly than the demand for their services; and, if the latter, has the relative increase in the number of the workers been due to immigration, or has it been owing to too many of the native or resident population entering the trade?

38. To what extent has female labour displaced male labour, or child labour taken the place of adult labour?

39. Does it sometimes or frequently happen that there is a scarcity of workers in some towns or cities and a surplus in others at the same time?

40. To what extent has the tenement house work shop system obtained a foothold in Canada?

For the purpose of obtaining information under these several heads I visited factories, workshops and private dwellings, making inquiries of both employers and employees, and personally inspected the condition of the shops and other places in which work is done. I also addressed, to employers and others, lists of such questions as I believed each would be best able to give information upon. Besides these means—for the purpose of getting a very full expression of the views and opinions of the classes immediately and particularly interested—I adopted the plan of holding a meeting in Toronto to which I invited the manufacturers, contractors and other employers, and also committees of the several organizations of employees engaged in the clothing trade. At the meetings, which were held on the evenings of the 8th and 9th of January, there were also present by my invitation a committee of the Toronto Trades and Labour Council and the three Ontario Inspectors of Factories, resident in Toronto, Mr. James R. Brown, Mr. Robert Barber and Miss Margaret Carlyle. I have appended a verbatim report of the proceedings of these meetings.

So as to be able to compare the condition of the several industries in Canada, in which the "sweating system" might be expected to be practised, with the conditions which obtain in similar industries in the United States, I placed myself in communication with Factories Inspectors, Commissioners of Labour and other officials in the several States of the Union, and attended a meeting of the American Federation of Labour held in the City of New York in December last. I also visited a number of "sweat shops" in Jersey City, N. J. The time occupied in my work of inspection covered a period of seventy nine days, from October 29th, to January 28th, inclusive.

I now proceed to give, I trust with sufficient circumstantiality, the result of my inquiries under the several heads already enumerated:—

1. I find that the practice under the first head varies. Some manufacturers, though only a few, have all their work done in factories of their own; some have their work done by contractors who have their own workshops; others give it out to people who make it up in their own homes; while still others, and the greater number, have it done partly in all these ways. In Hamilton, for example, the greater part of the work is done by contractors and the balance by people who work at home. In Toronto the same system prevails, though in that city the proportion of work done in private houses is greater. In Ottawa, Montreal and Quebec the contract system scarcely exists; I only found six such shops in Montreal and none in either of the other cities. In Montreal there are several of the manufacturers who have factories of their own, but in the three cities last named the greater part of the work is done by families in their homes. In Halifax the proportion of factory work is greater but there is a considerable quantity of goods made up in private houses. In all cases the goods are cut out on the premises of the wholesale manufacturer.

2. As already said, the system varies, but it may be added that, except in Montreal and Halifax and in some smaller towns, as Clinton, Ont., for example, there is, proportionately, very little factory work done; while only in Hamilton and Toronto does the contractors' shop system obtain to any extent. Though this is not an invariable rule, it is generally true that when manufacturers have their work done in part by contractors and in part by families working at home, the better and more highly paid work, such as men's coats, is made by the first, while pants and vests are made in private families.

3. It is difficult to get reliable information under this head for the reason that I found no instance where a manufacturer had given both systems a thorough trial under similar conditions. I found that those who have their own factories and those who have adopted the contract system each are of opinion that the method they have chosen is the one best calculated to promote their interests, both as to cheapness and quality of the work. Almost invariably, however, the employees prefer the factory system to working in the contractors' shops. Whether the belief is well founded or not, they are firmly of the opinion that the contracting system tends inevitably to the lowering of wages and degrading the conditions of labour. I have not been able to obtain reliable data which will throw light upon this question, for the reason that I did not have an opportunity to compare the wages and conditions of labour in the case of men employed at the same kinds of work in the same city, under the two systems. A comparison when and where the conditions were quite dissimilar would, of course, be worthless. In the absence of statistics or other reliable data it may not, however, be out of place to mention some of the reasons which employees advance in support of the opinion that wages and conditions of labour are prejudicially affected by the contracting system. The contractor, it is urged, being immediately interested in getting the work done cheaply, and being continually in close contact with the employees, is able and apt to resort to all kinds of methods to accomplish this. Being usually less prominent in the public eye than the large manufacturer, and so less amenable to the deterring influence of public opinion, it is argued that he is less likely to be deterred from cutting wages, if in other respects able to do so, and less likely also to have regard for the health and comfort of his employees. The contractors' shops being small and only a small number, comparatively, of employees working in them, it is more difficult for the workers to become organized for the purpose of keeping up wages and maintaining good conditions of employment. It is urged, too, that the contractors compete with each other and with private families for work, taking it often at ruinously low rates, and then must of necessity cut the wages to make up for the loss so entailed. Broadly it is held by the employees that all the profit the contractor makes must come out of the sum which would go to the workers as wages did they work directly for the manufacturer.

4. Except in the custom or ordered clothing trade there appears to be no agreements made between employers and employees, covering a period of time, as to wages or prices for making up goods. In the custom trade, where the workmen are organized, the employers and employees usually agree upon a scale of prices to remain in force for a term agreed upon, but neither in the ready-made clothing trade, the shirt industry,

the fur business, nor in any of the other occupations I inquired into, did I find anything of this kind. The price to be paid for making the various articles is usually stated when the goods are given out, it being the duty of some one in the employ of the manufacturer to fix the price. It seems almost inevitable that such a system must result in bringing the wages down to the lowest point at which the employees can afford to work—to what economists have designated the lowest existence point. This result is rendered the more certain by the fact that the separation of the workers where they work in their own homes, and the want of combination among the contractors, prevents a comparison, by them, of the prices offered.

5. I find no evidence of any agreement, understanding or combination among the manufacturers for the purpose of regulating the prices to be paid for making goods; though in the way of business they usually keep themselves informed as to the prices paid by their competitors.

6. For the same kinds or grades of work manufacturers pay the same prices whether the maker is a contractor or a person working in his or her own home; but, as already stated, different grades of work are usually done by the two classes.

7. I found no evidence that the manufacturers seek to control or in any way interfere with the wages paid by their contractors, or to keep themselves informed as to the rate of wages paid. The object of seeking information under this head was to ascertain whether the wholesale manufacturers attempted to regulate the prices to be paid by them in accordance with the wages paid by the contractors to their employees.

8. The contractors have no organizations or combinations of the kind suggested. At one time the contractors in Toronto had an organization or union, but it no longer exists. While it was in existence it was claimed, by one of those present at the meeting already referred to, that it attempted to regulate the wages to be paid to employees, but this is denied. It did attempt to regulate in some measure the prices at which work should be done for the wholesalers, but met with but little success, owing partly to want of unanimity among its members and partly to the pressure of competition on the part of non-members and of private families.

9. As a rule the sanitary condition of contractors' shops is good, though there are exceptions to this rule. In some of the shops I visited, while it might not be altogether correct to say that they were in an unsanitary condition, they were certainly far from cleanly, and were neither wholesome nor pleasant to work in. One in Toronto, in which a number of men, women and girls were engaged in making ladies' mantles and cloaks, if not unsanitary, must have bordered very closely upon being so. In no case did I find that manufacturers took any measures to keep themselves informed as to the condition of the shops or houses in which their goods were made up, either as to cleanliness or healthfulness. I did not find anywhere shops that graded down to the level of the sweaters' "dens" described in the report of the Commission of the British House of Lords, and in the reports of the United States Factories Inspectors, but I found not a few in which there was great room for improvement.

10. The practice of using shops in which clothing is made as living and sleeping rooms, which is so great a cause of complaint in England and in some American cities, does not obtain here, at least to any extent. When clothing is made in private houses, however, bed-rooms and living rooms are frequently used as work-rooms.

11. I could learn of no authenticated case of an infectious disease having been spread by means of garments made in contractors' shops or private houses, though I did hear of cases where scarlet fever and diphtheria had been known to exist in places where clothing was being made. That great and serious danger to the public health might readily arise from this source, unless means be taken to guard against it by proper inspection, is evident. It is true we have not, as yet at any rate, the tenement house system which is the cause of so much danger of the kind indicated in such cities as Chicago, for example, but even in ordinary workshops and dwellings better inspection than the laws now provide for is needed to ensure the public safety.

12. As far as I could ascertain the subcontracting system, which some in England have held to be the only one rightly deserving of the appellation "sweating system," does not exist in Canada. It may be that there is danger that with the tendency to

increasing subdivision of labour, it will obtain a foothold here, but it is worthy of note that, in England, where it was once common, it is said to be dying out.

13. Only in Toronto did I find that any custom or ordered clothing is made under the contract system, and there only trousers are made in this way. With this exception the contract system, so far as the clothing trade is concerned, is confined to the ready-made business.

14. The systems of having workshops on their premises and of allowing their workmen to take work home, are both common in the custom or ordered clothing trade. Many tailors, more particularly married men, prefer to work in their homes. Where the trade is organized the unions generally limit the number of hours per day for work in shops, and, by taking their work home, some who wish to work longer than the union rules permit, can do so without the knowledge of the union. The advantage of having the assistance of their families is a further inducement.

15. As stated under No. 3, I have not found it possible to obtain data which would justify the giving of a positive answer to this question. I have already given some of the reasons advanced by the employees in support of their belief that an affirmative answer should be given. It is but fair to say, however, that other reasons are put forward in support of the contention that not only is the contract system, in the clothing trade at any rate, not an evil in the direction indicated, but that it results in a positive gain to the employees by conserving and more profitably directing their labour, and so enabling them to earn and receive more than they otherwise would. I found that men working for contractors really received as good pay as, and not infrequently better pay than men who worked directly for the wholesale manufacturer for whom the contractor worked; but this comparison was not conclusive for the reason that the kinds of work were dissimilar. I found instances where manufacturers had abandoned the factory system and adopted the plan of having their work done by contractors, believing that they saved expense and trouble by doing so. In one such instance a reduction of the wages of the employees had followed the change, but there were attendant circumstances which made it uncertain whether the change from one system to the other had been the sole or even the principal cause of this. On the whole, my impression is that it would be a gain to the employees, and without any loss to the manufacturers, if the factory system could be substituted for the contractors' shop system. While I do not assert that as a rule the conditions in contractors' shops in Toronto and Hamilton are unsanitary or unwholesome, they do fall far short in these respects of the large factories in Montreal and Halifax. When a comparison is made, however, between the condition of the people who work in contractors' shops and the conditions which attend the making of garments in private houses, the advantage is, in a marked degree, in favour of the former system. While it might not be correct to assume that the substitution of factory work for the contract system would certainly result in the payment of higher wages, my opinion is that the tendency would be in this direction, while the gain to the workers in improved conditions of employment would be great. As compared with the plan of factory work I am of opinion that the contract system does result in reducing wages and in lowering the conditions of labour, but when the comparison is made between the second and the home work plan I am satisfied that the contract system secures higher pay and better conditions of labour.

16. There are many places in the cities of Ontario and Quebec—(there are no Factories Acts in the other provinces) in which clothing is made, which do not come under the provisions of the Factories Acts, and such places are not subject to the inspection and regulation of these Acts.

17. Even in factories and shops subject to the regulations and restrictions of the Factories Acts, there is found to be considerable difficulty in enforcing the provisions forbidding the employment of children under the factory age, and, as might be expected, in small shops and dwellings to which the Acts do not apply, children of very tender years are employed. I also found that in such places women and children work many more hours daily than would be permitted in shops and factories under the regulation of the Acts. The school laws check the evil of child labour to some extent, but do not by any means prevent it.

18. I found no positive evidence that the conditions in these small shops and dwellings were actually unsanitary, but in many instances they were very far from being cleanly, and not a few were the reverse of being comfortable working places. The ventilation was often bad and some of the rooms were too small for the number of people employed.

19. The competition of the small shops that do not come under the provisions of the Factories Acts, and the rivalry of people who work in their own homes undoubtedly has the effect of forcing contractors to take work at lower rates than they otherwise would, but this is only in part owing to the fact that they do not have to comply with the regulations of the Acts.

20. The Factories Acts, both in Ontario and Quebec, appear to be fairly well enforced and to give general satisfaction in their working, both to employers and employees. A greater number of inspectors, however, is needed, and more frequent publication of reports would be an advantage.

21. There is pressing need that the provisions of the Factories Acts should be very greatly broadened and extended so as to bring within their jurisdiction all places where goods intended for sale are manufactured. In accordance with an amendment to the Ontario Factories Act, which was assented to on April 16th of last year, the government of that province appointed, in addition to the male inspectors, one female inspector, who is doing very efficient work, but it is not possible that one woman can effectually watch over even the factories and shops now under the Act, and it would be quite beyond the power of the present staff to do the work if the law were amended so as to bring the small shops under its regulations.

22. I do not find that employers in Ontario and Quebec are as yet suffering any disadvantage because of the enforcement of the Factories Acts in these provinces. It is very evident, however, that should competition become keen between them and manufacturers in other provinces where there are no such Acts in force, they would be placed at a very serious disadvantage. In the absence of common legislation in the several provinces it is a cause of regret among the working classes that there is no Dominion legislation of this character.

23. The general opinion among employers and workingmen is that no one province could enact stringent legislation for the purpose of checking or preventing the "sweating system," without great risk of injury to business in that province, and that the probable effect of the enactment of such legislation would be the transference of the business to other provinces where such restrictive laws might not be enacted. Such a result appears to have followed the enactment of "anti-sweating" laws in some of the States of the neighbouring Union, notably New York and Massachusetts.

24. Should the Dominion Parliament enact legislation for the purpose indicated, both manufacturers and employees appear to fear that it would result in greater imports of ready-made clothing and a lessening of the quantity made in the Dominion, unless the import duties were raised sufficiently to cover the increased cost of manufacture.

25. Attempts have been made in several of the American States to check the "sweating system" by requiring that all goods should be labelled or ticketed so as to show whether they were made in factories, contractors' shops, private houses or tenement houses. These attempts have been followed by a limited measure of success only. It has been proposed by members of labour organizations and others anxious to uproot the "sweating" evil, and careless, perhaps, as to the consequences in other directions of the suggested remedy, that a system of labelling or tagging should be adopted and legally enforced that would practically have the effect of making all ready-made clothing, except such as should be made in factories, unsaleable, by attaching to it a suspicion of having been made under uncleanly or unsanitary conditions. While some of the working people with whom I conversed on this subject expressed themselves as desirous of having the labelling system tried, I did not find that, as a rule, they regarded its success, as a means of substituting factory work for the contractors' shop or home work systems, as more than problematical. Manufacturers on the other hand are generally of opinion that such legislation would be vexatious and troublesome to them without resulting in any corresponding benefit either to the public or to their employees.

26. The answers of employers and employees to this question entirely disagree. The former are, as a rule, opposed to the adoption of the plan of licensing shops and houses where goods are made up for them, holding that it would be an annoying interference with business, and that little if any good would result from it. The employees on the contrary, believe that by reason of the better inspection, which the licensing system could be made the means of ensuring, and the improved conditions as to sanitation and cleanliness which they believe would result, the conditions of their employment would be greatly improved. The contractors generally agree with the views of the employees on this question, and would be willing, as a rule, to agree to the imposition of a license.

27. The information gathered under this head indicates that the tendency is towards lower wages, both as to the prices paid for piecework and as to the aggregate amount received by the employees.

28. While the tendency towards lower wages is less marked in some branches of the clothing trade than in others, there cannot be said to be any branch in which the tendency is, in any marked degree, towards higher wages. While I found isolated individual cases which, at first sight, seemed to indicate that there was an upward tendency, fuller investigation showed that there were exceptional reasons for these cases and that, even in the most favourable circumstanced divisions of the trade, there is really no evidence of a tendency towards higher wages.

29. Competition among contractors and among workmen has undoubtedly resulted in the lowering of the prices for making goods and of the rate of wages. The introduction of improved labour-saving machinery and appliances, and the subdivision of labour have likewise had a similar result, but the tendency towards lower wages is mainly due to the general reduction of the prices of finished goods. I do not find that combinations among employers have played any part in preventing the rise or in causing the fall of the rate of wages.

30. There cannot be said to be an apprenticeship system in the ready-made clothing trade. "Learners" are employed—usually young girls and boys—but the employer is under no obligation to teach them a trade or any part of one. Evidently such a system is capable of gross abuse and there are not wanting instances of such abuse by unscrupulous employers. I learned of one contractor, engaged in making pants and vests, who makes a practice of employing "learners" who engage to work for him without wages while they are learning the trade. These learners, usually girls, are kept at some trivial and easily mastered work, such as pulling out basting threads, sewing on buttons, or running up seams on a sewing machine, and then, when the term for which they agreed to work without wages expires, they are discharged, without having had an opportunity to learn any trade by which they can earn a livelihood, their places being filled by other "learners" who are in turn defrauded out of several months of work and time. It is not easy to determine just what effect the existence of such an "apprenticeship system" may have upon wages, but it is abundantly evident that when fair employers are forced to compete with those who take advantage of the opportunities which such a system offers to the unscrupulous, the effect must be detrimental.

32. The systems of payment by the day or week and by piecework both prevail in factories and contractors' shops. It is not usual to fix a task or stint as a day's work though the system is not unknown. Even when there is no task set as the day's work, employees usually understand that the retention of their situations depends upon their regularly doing what is regarded as a fair day's work.

33. The piecework system is probably more usual where women and children are employed than it is among male employees, but the division cannot be said to be upon sex lines. Having regard, however, to the fact that all work done in private houses is done on the piecework system and is mainly done by women, it is evident that much the greater part of the clothing made under the piecework system is made by women.

34. I could not obtain data which would justify a positive answer to this question: though if the whole trade be considered,—home work as well as factory and shop work—it is probable that the higher wages are received by those who work by the day or week.

35. Ten hours per day or sixty hours per week is the usual time worked in factories and workshops, but in private houses the time is irregular and the number of hours of work usually more.

36. I did not find evidence that the system of fining for imperfect or spoiled work prevails to such an extent as to involve injustice. It is worth noting, however, that one of the most serious disadvantages, which those who work for manufacturers in their own homes labour under as compared with those who work in factories or contractors' shops, arises from this system. When an employee in a factory or contractor's shop does imperfect work, necessitating an alteration, only the time required to make the alteration is lost. On the other hand, a person working at home must carry the goods back again, frequently losing half a day because of having to make an alteration which in actual work only requires a few minutes of time. To avoid this they are often willing to submit to a fine or reduction of wages far in excess of what the making of the alteration would be worth to them. I found that, as a rule, those employed in contractors' shops are not held responsible for the making of alterations and are thus freed from the responsibility and loss to which those employed in factories and private houses are subject. Though not strictly pertinent here, it may not be amiss to say that manufacturers uniformly bear testimony to the honesty of those who work for them in their homes. Many thousands of dollars' worth of goods pass through the hands of this class of people every month, yet losses through dishonesty are scarcely known. I was informed by one manufacturer in Montreal that, though his goods were sometimes out of his warehouse for months, his entire losses did not amount to one dollar per year and that he never knew of a case of real dishonesty.

37. The information gathered under this head does not show that there is much if any change in the relative number of the unemployed in the trades under investigation. There has been a pretty steady increase in the quantity of ready-made clothing manufactured, and this has given employment to a greater number of men, women and children, notwithstanding the introduction of labour saving machinery and the adoption of improved methods of manufacture, but the increased demand for labour has been fully met and the relative number of the temporarily unemployed is no less than formerly. I do not find that the labour market in the trades under investigation has been to any considerable extent affected by immigration, though there have been instances of workers having been brought to Canada to take the places of men who were "on strike," and it is a cause of complaint among Canadian workmen that while the United States laws are strictly and even harshly enforced against any of them who seek employment across the lines, there is no Canadian law to protect them against American labour in similar ways. In connection with this head I would again refer to what has been said under No. 30. The throwing of the "learners" there referred to on the labour market, necessarily results in an increase of the number of unemployed.

38. The number of females employed in the ready-made clothing trade is relatively greater than the number of males, and, as a consequence, as the production of ready-made clothing increases in comparison with the making of ordered or custom clothing, the number of female employees becomes proportionally greater than the number of males. For the same reason, and in about the same proportion, child labour increases as compared with adult labour.

39. Both employers and employees suffer loss by reason of there being at times, and frequently, a scarcity of labour in one locality contemporaneously with a surplus in another, but the trades under investigation do not suffer more in this way than do others.

40. I do not find that the tenement house workshop system has as yet been introduced in Canada, but, except the absence of the very high rents which prevail in American cities in which it exists, there are none of the conditions wanting here which have created the system elsewhere. A provision of the British Factory and Workshops Acts would, if adopted here, be a great safeguard against the commencement of the tenement house shop system. This provision is that every occupier of every factory or workshop from which wearing apparel and other specified goods are given out to be made up outside of the factory or workshop, shall keep a list of all persons to whom they are

so given out, and copies of these lists must be furnished to the inspector half yearly. The form prescribed is as follows :—

Address of factory or workshop or place from which work is given out _____

Name of occupier of factory or workshop or place _____

Business carried on _____

Names of persons employed by the occupier outside the factory or workshop or place from which work is given out, and places where they are employed, viz.:—

A.—PERSONS so employed as workmen.

Christian and Surname.	Place where Employed.

B.—PERSONS so employed as contractors.

Christian and Surname.	Place where Employed.

A similar list must be kept by contractors of all persons working for them outside their shops, and furnished in the same way to the inspectors.

As will be seen from the foregoing, I have directed my attention almost exclusively to the investigation of the "sweating system," so called, in connection with the clothing trade. I have done so partly because the time at my disposal did not permit of a more extended investigation, and partly because among the industries in which the "sweating system" might be expected to exist, this is the one in which the evils of the system—the danger to public health and the injury to employees—would be most likely to be found to prevail. I was also influenced by the belief that whatever legislative remedies can be applied to check or prevent the evil in this industry must necessarily be equally efficient as regards other trades. As has been already stated, the excise laws of Canada operate to prevent the extension of the "sweating system" to the cigar-making industry, which is the only other trade in the United States in which the evil has been found to exist to any great extent. In Montreal, Toronto and Quebec there is some giving out of fur goods to be made in private houses, and in the first named city some of the work in the shoe trade is done in this way. In the shirt industry the home work system prevails to a not inconsiderable extent, and any statements hereinafter made concerning that system in connection with the clothing business may be considered as applying in some degree to this industry.

The development of the "sweating system"—including in the term the contractors' shops and the home work system—has been coincident with the business revolution

which has, within a quarter of a century, changed that industry from one in which the proportion of custom made goods to ready-made was about as nine to one, to one in which the proportion of ordered clothing is probably not more, if as much, as forty per cent. The development of the ready-made industry by the subdivision of labour has rendered unnecessary the employment of so great a proportion of specially skilled handicraftsmen and made it possible to give employment to less skilled and cheaper labour. Garments being made in assortments, and it being no longer necessary to make each special garment to fit a particular wearer, they are cut out by machinery and then each part of the work of making up and finishing is done by men, women and children skilled in doing that particular part. In this way what may be called the "team work" system has arisen, which has, in the ready made clothing and shoe trades, practically done away with the necessity for employing completely skilled tradesmen. The factory and its modification the contract shop in which this "team work" system can be most effectively and economically practised, has taken the place, in great measure, of the tailor shop and the shoemaker shop. The house work system is but another development of the "team system," as under it the family becomes a "team."

Stated briefly, the contract system in the clothing trade is carried on in this way: In the warehouses of the large wholesale manufacturers the clothing is cut out. It is then sent in lots to contractors who have their own shops. These contractors, usually, and for their own convenience and advantage, confine themselves as far as practicable to the making of some particular kind of garments, coats, trousers, vests, mantles or overcoats for example. They can thus most profitably utilize their machinery, and, by subdivision, the labour of their employees. The wholesaler takes no responsibility for the payment of the wages of the employees of the contractor, nor does he hold himself in any measure responsible for the condition of the shops in which the goods are made up. With the receiving back of the finished goods and the payment of the contract price for finishing, his responsibility ends. In every case I found that the wholesale manufacturers disclaimed positively any further obligation.

As I have already stated, under No. 12, the system of subcontracting can hardly be said to exist in Canada, and it would, therefore, not be necessary to refer to it here were it not for the reason that, as it is the system under which the greatest evils and most deplorable conditions have developed in other countries, it would seem to be the part of wisdom, when considering measures for the purpose of checking the introduction or growth of the "sweating" evil in Canada, to have special regard to the prevention of this system. This remark applies as well to the tenement house shop system. In the United States, where, in some of the cities, this last system largely prevails, there are numerous well authenticated instances of the spreading of contagious diseases, such as measles, scarlet, spotted and typhoid fevers, erysipelas, whooping cough, diphtheria and small-pox, by means of garments made in tenement houses under unsanitary conditions.

While the investigation has shown that the "sweating system" with its attendant and consequent evils does not exist in Canada to the same or nearly to the same extent that it obtains in Great Britain and in the United States, it has also shown that there is absent from Canada no single one of the primary conditions from which the system has developed in those countries. It would therefore seem that any remedies which have been found, or which it is probable would have been found, if tried, effectual in other countries to cure the evil, would likewise, making allowance for differing conditions, be efficacious in preventing its commencement or further growth here. For this reason I have considered it a part of my duty to indicate some of the remedies which have been tried or proposed in the neighbouring republic—that being the country whose conditions most nearly resemble our own—accompanying this resumé of the law, and proposed legislation of the several states and of the United States with such remarks as the information elicited during my investigation may seem to call for.

The Commonwealth of Massachusetts appears to have taken the initiative in distinct legislative effort to check the "sweating system." By the law of that state passed in 1891, and amended in 1892, every house, room or place used as a dwelling in which garments or wearing apparel of any kind is made wholly or partially, or altered or repaired, except houses occupied exclusively by the members of the family, were declared

to be workshops, and placed under the inspection of the district police, whose duty it is to examine all such garments, etc., "for the purpose of ascertaining whether said garments * * * are in cleanly condition and free from vermin and every matter of an infectious and contagious nature." Persons occupying or having control of workshops are required to notify the district police or the special inspector of the location of the workshop, the nature of the work to be carried on and the number of the persons employed. Every person working in any such workshop is required before commencing work, "to procure a license, approved by the chief of the district police upon the recommendation of the inspectors especially appointed for the enforcement of the provisions" of the Act. If the inspector finds evidence of infectious disease in any workshop or in any goods manufactured or in process of manufacture therein, it becomes his duty to report the facts to the chief of the district police, whose duty it is in turn to notify the State Board of Health, which body, if it finds the shop in an unhealthy condition, or the clothing unfit for use, is required "to issue such order or orders as the public safety may require." If it is reported to the inspector that clothing is being imported into the state which has been manufactured wholly or in part under unhealthy conditions, it becomes his duty to examine the goods and the condition of their manufacture and if the goods or any of them are "found to contain vermin, or to have been made in improper places or under unhealthy conditions he shall make report thereof to the State Board of Health, which board shall thereupon make such order or orders as the safety of the public may require." Whoever sells or exposes for sale clothing "made in a tenement house used as a workshop" is required to have attached to each garment a tag or label not less than one inch wide by two inches long, on which shall be written or printed the words "Tenement Made" and the name of the state, city or town in which the article was made. No person is permitted to sell or expose for sale any such garment without such label or tag or "any of said garments with a tag or label in any manner false or fraudulent," nor shall any "wilfully remove, alter or destroy any such tag or label upon each of said garments when exposed for sale." A penalty of not less than fifty nor more than one hundred dollars is attached for the violation of any of the provisions of the Act.

In its practical working the effect of the Massachusetts law is said to be (1) That the chief of the district police and the inspectors interpret it as bringing the houses, rooms, &c., within the meaning of the factories law, as "workshops." The effects of this interpretation are (a) that separate water-closets are required for men and women, and (b) that the ten-hour law for women and for minors under eighteen is made to apply. As owners of tenement houses are seldom willing to go to the expense entailed by (a), this method of interpreting and enforcing the Act has a decided tendency towards abolishing the tenement house system. (2) By their method of enforcing the tagging or labeling system the inspectors are said to make the law almost as effective against tenement-made goods from other states as it is against such goods made in Massachusetts. It is claimed that the tenement house shops have virtually ceased to exist in Boston as the result of the enforcement of the law. Less clothing is said to be made in New York for the Boston market, while more is made in Boston and more in Maine. This last claim does not, however, harmonize with the information upon which I based the statement made under No. 23. So far were the members of the congressional committee who examined into the working of the law from accepting this optimistic view, that in their report to Congress they speak of the result of the working of the law as "a typical illustration of the defects of local law." This committee in its report held it to have been demonstrated that the result of the enforcement of the Massachusetts law had been to encourage the sending of goods to be made in other states, often under unsanitary conditions and then selling them as "Made under the Massachusetts law." (3) The effect of the licensing system is said to have been that the homes in which clothing is made have been greatly improved in the matter of cleanliness and comfort. The method of licensing is that at first a temporary license for thirty days is granted, and, after the place is inspected, the license is either extended or made permanent. The conditions required before the license is made permanent and which must be promised before it will be

extended, are: (a) absolute cleanliness; (b) that no rooms used as sleeping apartments shall be used as work-rooms, and that no garments, either finished or in process of manufacture, shall be allowed to be kept or to remain in sleeping rooms; (c) that notice must be sent to the inspector of intended removal or of the breaking out of any contagious or infectious disease either in the family of the person holding the license or of any family residing in the same building, and (d) that no person not a member of the family shall be employed on the premises licensed in the work of making or finishing wearing apparel intended for sale.

The law of New York, which was enacted in 1892, is, except as hereinafter noted, almost identical with the Massachusetts law in its provisions. Besides articles of wearing apparel covered by the Massachusetts law, and which it enumerates, the New York law applies to the making of purses, feathers, artificial flowers and cigars. Instead of, as in Massachusetts, merely commanding the State Board of Health, when clothing is found to be infected or unfit for use, to "make such order or orders as the safety of the public may require," the New York law enjoins the Board of Health "to condemn and destroy all such infectious and contagious articles." The licenses in the New York law are called permits, and are issued or granted by the Board of Health to persons found worthy, upon inspection by the inspector or the Board of Health. The penalty for violation of the New York law is not less than one hundred nor more than five hundred dollars.

The provisions of the Illinois law which apply to the "sweating system" are contained in three sections of the Factories Act. These forbid that any room in a dwelling or tenement house used as an eating or sleeping room shall be used for the manufacture of wearing apparel and the other articles enumerated in the New York law, except by the immediate members of a family living therein. The remainder of this section and the other two sections of the Factories Act which apply, regulate the inspection of workshops and of clothing, etc., in the same way as the New York law. There are no provisions for labelling or tagging the goods nor for licensing or granting permits as in the Massachusetts and New York laws.

In none of the other states are there any laws specially aimed at the prevention or checking of the "sweating system," nor are there any sections of the Factories Acts of these states capable of being so enforced as to operate as a check on the system which would be at all likely to be effectual. It may be well to note here that the New York Court of Special Sessions has recently given a decision, which, if it be upheld by the higher courts, will make the New York law in a great measure ineffective. A man was being prosecuted by one of the inspectors for employing persons, not members of his family, to work at making clothing in a tenement house, without the permit required by the Act. The Court of Special Sessions discharged the accused, holding that it is not unlawful to hire persons, not members of the family living in it, to manufacture clothing in a tenement house, notwithstanding the law forbidding it.

In the hope that a Federal law, embracing in its scope all the states, will be effectual to prevent the "sweating system," a bill has been introduced in the present congress under the title of "A Bill to raise Additional Revenue for the Support of the Government." The title of the bill is, of course, pretextual inasmuch as the raising of revenue is not its object but a means by which it is hoped that another object will be accomplished. The proposed measure may be summarized as follows: It provides that when a manufacturer gives out materials from which clothing and other manufactured articles enumerated in the bill are to be made by contractors and others not directly in the employment of the manufacturer in his own factory, the said manufacturer shall pay in advance to the United States Revenue Collector a tax of \$300 per year for each contractor or person to whom material is so given out. The bill also provides that any contractor or other person taking materials from a manufacturer for the purpose of making them up, who shall sub-let the work of making up or finishing the goods, shall also pay a yearly tax of \$300 in the same way for each person to whom he sub-lets any part of the work. Should the work be again sub-contracted or divided, the person so sub-letting or dividing it will be subject to a like yearly tax of \$300 for each person so employed by him.

There can be no doubt that such a measure, if it should be passed, and could be enforced, would effectually put an end to the "sweating system" in the trades to which it would apply, and compel the manufacture of clothing, etc., in factories operated by the manufacturers. With such a law in force only the larger and more well to do contractors, who could afford to advance the money for the manufacturers to pay the tax, could continue in business. Small contractors and all home workers would certainly be driven out of the trade. Viewed only from the standpoint of those employed in shops and factories it would be an advantage, doubtless, to have legislation enacted which would abolish the home work system. Possibly this might be an advantage to the trade as a whole, or at any rate to those who might ultimately be found to remain in it, but in the meantime it might not be easy to justify legislation which must inevitably result in depriving many worthy people of their only means of earning a livelihood.

It may be of interest to observe, concerning the proposed Federal law just mentioned, that, before its introduction in congress, a draft of the measure had formed the subject of discussion at a convention of the National Association of Factories Inspectors, and that it had received the approval of that body. The association seemed to be convinced that all attempts to abolish the "sweating system" by state legislation must in the nature of things prove abortive and so favoured an attempt to destroy the tenement house and home work system—the principal cause and the stronghold of the evil — by a Federal law which should accomplish its real purpose under the pretense of imposing a revenue tax.

It will be observed that the difficulty which lies in the way of successfully attacking the "sweating system" by means of legislative enactments, in the United States, arises out of the question of where Federal jurisdiction on the one hand and State authority on the other begins and ends. It is not claimed by those who advocate the passage of the proposed Federal law already referred to, that the laws of Massachusetts or of New York, for example, would be inefficient or ineffectual, were it not for the fact that they are only state laws having no force outside the states passing them. I am assured that those who, under existing circumstances, are advocating and supporting the proposed Federal law, would greatly prefer a national law framed on the lines of the state laws referred to, were the enactment of such a law within the jurisdiction of the Federal congress. Forced to make choice between state legislation calculated to check the "sweating" evil while not doing injury to worthy working people, and inefficient only because the states cannot enforce it beyond their own boundaries; and a Federal law which aims at curing the evil by the clumsy, if effectual, method of killing the patient, they choose the latter.

I am conscious that, in this report, I should avoid making suggestions or specific recommendations to authorities by whom I have not been commissioned and to whom I am not answerable, and I am aware that some of the suggestions which I deem it to be my duty to make, will, possibly, have reference to matters that under the constitution and by the terms of the British North America Act, come more properly within the powers of the Provincial legislatures than of the Dominion Parliament. At the same time, I realize that, not being equipped with the knowledge necessary to determine where the authority of parliament and of the legislatures begins and ends, I might easily, should I be over careful to avoid seeming to trench upon provincial authority, run a danger of omitting suggestions which, perhaps, after all, I ought to have made. I have, therefore, deemed it best to make the suggestions and recommendations which seem to me to be called for by the facts as disclosed by my investigation, leaving it to others more competent than I to decide as to where the authority may be vested to accept or reject them.

As elsewhere remarked, it has not been found possible to obtain, through the medium of a temporary commission, reliable, detailed and accurate statistical information on the questions of wages and of the conditions of life and labour among the working classes. If Canada is to be brought up to an equality in this respect, with other countries and with some of the sister colonies, it is of primary importance that such statistical information be collected and published at intervals of sufficient frequency to make the information contained in the reports promptly available. Even were the

information which is contained in the census returns given sufficiently in detail, it is not corrected and published with sufficient frequency to make it really useful in the direction indicated. I would recommend that the Act, chapter 15 of the Acts of 1890, be put in force, and that the officers appointed under that Act be directed to give special and immediate attention to the collection of statistical and other information bearing upon the wages paid, and the conditions of life and labour among those engaged in the making of clothing, fur goods, shirts, collars and cuffs, neckties, boots and shoes, feather goods, and corsets, and also similar information bearing upon the condition of those employed in laundries and bakers' shops. Such officers should also be instructed to collect, as speedily as may be possible, information concerning the employment and condition of Chinese living within the Dominion.

The provisions of the Factories Acts should be extended so as to include within the sphere of their regulations all factories and workshops, and all dwellings in which more than the husband and wife are employed and in which articles of any kind intended for sale are being manufactured. Whatever objections may be properly urged against interference of this nature in the case of families working in their own homes, none can, I think, be validly advanced on the ground of improper invasion of the sanctity of the home, against subjecting to inspection and regulation houses in which, by the employment of non-members of the family, the privacy which makes the home sacred has been surrendered. Even in those cases in which those employed are the children of the parents living in the house it does not seem to me that, for that reason, there should be no inspection or supervision in the interest and for the protection of the general public. The right of parents to work their children is not so indisputable and indefeasible nor of a nature so sacred that society is bound to take the risk of illiteracy and moral and physical deterioration in deference to it.

It is necessary, too, that the provisions of the Factories Acts concerning the inspection of the factories and workshops and the regulation of the conditions of labour therein should be uniform throughout the Dominion. Whether this can be secured only by concurrent and similar legislation by the several provinces, or whether it is constitutionally within the power of parliament to enact a Dominion Factories Act, it is not my province to suggest. But that it is necessary that either there should be one Factories Act for the Dominion, or that, in their main provisions at any rate, the Factories Acts of all the provinces should be similar, is the unanimous opinion of all employers as well as employees with whom I have spoken on the subject. I believe it would conduce to the effectiveness of the Factories Acts if the plan were adopted of having one chief inspector who would have the supervision and direction of a sufficiently numerous staff of male and female deputy inspectors. This would ensure, besides greater efficiency, uniformity in the enforcement of the provisions and regulations of the law.

Under No. 39 attention is called to the loss which both employers and workers suffer, because of it frequently happening that workmen are idle in one town or city when their services are needed in another. I would recommend that, either as a part of the work of the bureau of labour statistics or in some other way, a system of labour registration should be adopted, so that workingmen might be kept informed promptly, as to where a demand might exist for their services, and employers at the same time advised as to where workmen could be obtained.

Canadian workmen complain of the injustice to them of allowing labourers and mechanics to be brought to Canada under contracts made in other countries. The province of Ontario has enacted legislation making such contracts not binding as against the employees, which is as far, probably, as a provincial legislature could constitutionally go in the direction of remedying the evil, but there is no legislation of this kind in the other provinces and no Dominion legislation of this nature. I would recommend that a Dominion law be enacted prohibiting, under a sufficient penalty, the making of contracts in other countries for the performance of labour in Canada. This law should be made as far reaching as is consistent with our position as an integral part of the empire. It is not my province to say whether or not such a law could be made to apply to contracts made in the mother country or in the other colonies, but it may be permissible for me

to suggest that such an application of it would not differ materially in principle from the enforcement of some of the present immigration regulations. It would also seem that the Ontario law just referred to involves, in some measure, the same principle. If it is competent for a province to nullify contracts made in Great Britain and in other colonies, no greatly differing principle would seem to be involved in forbidding the making of these contracts.

In the midst of my investigation, one of those regrettable industrial disturbances, a strike, or, in this case, to speak more correctly, a lock-out, occurred in the custom or ordered clothing trade in the city of Toronto. This difficulty at the date of writing this report has not been adjusted. I refer to this not for the purpose of expressing any opinion as to whether the balance of justice or injustice, of right or wrong, inclined to one side or the other, which I should have no right here to do, but in order that I may, perhaps the more effectively, point out some means by which such prolonged industrial conflicts may be prevented or rendered less common. I am strongly of opinion that a Dominion Board of mediation and arbitration could be made the means of averting or satisfactorily settling a very large proportion of the labour difficulties and industrial mis-understandings which now eventuate in strikes and lock-outs involving great and never wholly repaired losses to both capital and labour. Such a board could act both initially at the request of either party or of both parties to a dispute, or as a court of appeal from the findings of local voluntary boards of conciliation and arbitration, which might be organized somewhat after the manner of the French *Conseils des Prud'hommes*, as such voluntary boards are organized in some of the states of the neighbouring republic, or as provided in "The Trades Disputes Act of 1894" of Ontario. It would not, in my opinion, be either practical or desirable to give such a board power to enforce its decisions, except, perhaps, in the case of transportation companies, telegraph, electric or gas companies enjoying public franchises, but the mere intervention of such a board and its conciliatory hearing of both parties to the dispute would, I believe, in the majority of cases, result in either preventing a strike or lock-out or in settling the difficulty.

As has been elsewhere stated, there is not in the trades to which I have directed my attention, anything which can be rightly designated as an "apprenticeship system," and, as has been also stated, the plan of taking in "learners" at low wages, or no wages, with the understanding that they are to be taught a trade, or branch of trade, or given opportunities for learning one, is open to great abuse and sometimes results in great injustice. Both for the protection of "learners" and in the interest of honourable employers legislation should be enacted to punish frauds of this sort against young persons. This legislation might take the form of requiring, whenever any woman or young person is employed as a "learner," under an agreement or understanding, expressed or implied, that, in consideration of their working for a specified time at low wages or without wages, they will be taught or given proper opportunity to learn a particular trade or branch of a trade; then the employer shall be required, under a suitable penalty, to teach them the trade or branch of trade or afford them proper opportunities for learning it, as the case may be. Failure to either teach or afford proper opportunities for learning the trade or branch of trade should be made a misdemeanour, and if on trial it should appear that the employer did not himself know the trade or branch of trade, and had not the necessary means or conveniences for teaching or affording opportunities for learning it, this should be considered evidence of guilt.

For the purpose of ensuring the payment of the wages of the employees of contractors, I would recommend that the wholesale manufacturer employing the contractor be made legally responsible for the payment of such wages for a reasonable time. This principle is already conceded in the mechanics' lien laws, and, except a little trouble, it need not entail either hardship or risk upon the manufacturers, since they could require the contractors, before being paid for making the goods, to satisfy them that the wages had been paid, or they could require the contractors to deposit with them a sum sufficient to cover the risk. I do not find that contractors make any objections to such an arrangement, but, on the contrary, would welcome it as a means of relieving them from the unfair competition of unscrupulous men, who offer to take work at rates which men intending to pay wages cannot compete with.

While I would not advocate the adoption of the labelling or tagging system as an indirect way of preventing the making of goods in small shops and homes by making the goods made therein unsaleable; and while, as pointed out under No. 40, the tenement house shop system does not as yet exist in Canada, I would yet, having regard to the fact that we have no guarantee of continued exemption from this evil, recommend that whenever clothing, &c., shall be made in any tenement house, it be required that a label or tag shall be attached somewhat after the manner provided in the Massachusetts law. I would also recommend that, for the purpose of effectually enforcing such a regulation, the words "tenement house" should be defined to mean any house used in whole or in part as a dwelling, and in which more than one family shall reside.

There appear to be many advantages attending the adoption of the licensing system as enforced in Massachusetts and New York, and I would recommend the adoption of a similar system in Canada. In addition to the conditions attached to the granting of a license or permit in the states named, I would recommend that it be required, before any license or permit to manufacture goods in any shop or dwelling is made permanent, that in every room to be used as a work-room there shall not be less than 250 cubic feet of air space for each person employed in the day time, and not less than 400 cubic feet for each person employed at night, except in rooms lighted by means of electricity when the allowance of air space might be less than 400 cubic feet at night.

I would recommend that it be made a misdemeanour for any manufacturer, contractor or other person, to give out or cause to be given out any wearing apparel to be made, cleaned or repaired in any dwelling or building used partly as a dwelling whilst an inmate thereof is suffering from any contagious or infectious disease, unless such manufacturer, contractor or other person shall prove that he was not aware of the existence of the disease in the building or dwelling, and could not reasonably have been expected to have become aware of it.

As a further measure for the prevention of the introduction of the tenement house shop system into the Dominion, and as a means of assisting the factories inspectors in the efficient discharge of their duties, I would recommend that manufacturers and others be required to furnish to the factories inspectors, lists of persons to whom they give out work to be done outside their own factories or warehouses, as required by the British Factories and Workshops Acts, explained under No. 40.

All of which is respectfully submitted.

A. W. WRIGHT.

Toronto, March 6th, 1896.

SUPPLEMENTARY REPORT

[61a]

Upon the Sweating System in Canada, being an Appendix to the Report.

EVIDENCE TAKEN ON WEDNESDAY AND THURSDAY NIGHTS, JAN.
8TH AND 9TH AT RICHMOND HALL, TORONTO.

The Commissioner opened the meeting by stating that he had prepared a number of questions to which he would invite replies from any present who might be able to answer them. He wished all to feel that the freest possible expression of opinion was invited. It was not desired to confine the proceedings to a series of replies to his questions, and it was hoped that each would exercise the right to ask any further questions which might occur to them. The questions he would ask were to be considered merely as a sort of framework for what he hoped would be a very free expression of the views of those present. His first question was:

Do the manufacturers or wholesale men depute the giving out of work to some foreman or other employee who arbitrarily fixes the prices to be paid?

Mr. L. GUROFSKY.—As far as I can understand, prices are fixed by the bosses of the warehouses. In Lailey & Watson's, for instance, I believe that it has been the custom for the firm and their foreman to meet in the spring and fix the prices. In Johnston & Co. two men—sort of foremen—take in and give out all the work. These two men also fix the price.

The Commissioner.—Is it the business of some one person in each shop to fix the price as the goods go out?

Mr. GUROFSKY.—Those I have mentioned I can speak of with certainty. They are, however, only two leading houses out of a dozen and a half or so here.

The Commissioner.—Is the competition between contractors keen and does it result in cutting prices?

Mr. GUROFSKY.—There is a keen competition amongst them, especially now, when the strike is on. They have a lot of work lying on their hands. The warehouses have fixed price. They ask a contractor "how much will you give for it?" When he names his price they do not immediately give him the work. They call in another and obtain his price, then give it to the lowest bidder. In giving out large quantities they mix up the work—good and common. The contractors would not often take the common work, but are compelled to do so in order to get the good. The contractors are pitted against each other all the time.

Mr. JAMES STRACHAN.—Is there a contractor standing between you and the men who manufacture?

Mr. GUROFSKY.—Indeed there is, sometimes two.

Mr. D. J. O'DONOGHUE.—Is the contract sometimes a sub-contract?

Mr. GUROFSKY.—Yes, sometimes.

Mr. Wm. E. TODD.—That question has been well brought out?

Mr. A. F. JURY asked whether the question was intended to cover fully all the work done by contracts—including the work given out to women who completed it at their homes?

The Commissioner.—That phase of the question will be fully brought out.

The COMMISSIONER. — Have the contractors an association which attempts to fix or regulate the prices to be paid by the wholesaler or manufacturer, on the one hand; or the wages, or prices for piece work to be paid the employees?

Mr. GROSSKY. — They have no such association now. They attempted to form one to fix the prices made by manufacturers and to regulate the hands, but were unsuccessful. I don't believe there is any such association among the warehousemen — the ones dealing exclusively in clothing, I don't think there is any understanding between them. They all try to cut down the workmen, as far as possible, but independent of each other.

The COMMISSIONER. — Is it at all a common practice for employees or members of the families of contractors to sleep in the work-rooms or use clothing, in the course of manufacture, for bedding? Perhaps the factories inspectors, who I am glad to see have been good enough to attend the meeting, would favour us with some information under this head.

Factories Inspector JAS. R. BROWN. — I don't think that we have any opportunity of knowing of that kind of thing here. We can scarcely recognize these as what are termed sweat-shops, for the simple reason that these contractors have been in business for many years, and it is only within the last few years complaints have been made with regard to diseases. With reference to clothing being made in private houses. At certain seasons of the year the number of persons is not sufficient to come under the Factory Act. One might go a dozen times and not find the number. At other times, however, you might go and find the number sufficient for the Act to apply. Having some knowledge of the matter — In Chicago I accompanied the inspector and saw something of it there. I mentioned with a view to the idea that legislation might be sought to prevent clothing being given to private houses where it might be that infectious diseases were in existence. But so far as I am concerned, I don't know personally of any case here. Some of the contractors have stated to me that one great evil where the clothing is given out to the wives of workmen is that the women will take it at less than the contractors would get for it. That is one of the competitions the contractors have. Of course some of the contractors may be here. They would be better able to tell.

Factories Inspector MISS MARGARET CARLISLE. — There is just one case I have in my mind. It occurred in Hamilton. I have come across none in Toronto so far.

Factories Inspector ROBERT BARBER. — I am not in a position to say that any made use of the clothing for bedding, but have found a few places in this city where work was done in filthy houses. I have asked them to clean up, and some who objected have removed, unfortunately. That is a class of people that can be seldom found a second time, when we want to see them again. But I do not know any one making use of the clothing as bedding.

Mr. D. J. O'DONOGHUE. — Do you think that the people you want to find move because you are looking after them?

Inspector BARBER. — I would not like to say that. It is a question of rent often. Last summer walking up a street in "the wards" I heard machines going in a house. I went in and found a place I had not previously known of. I went in and inspected it. I went again two weeks after and found that the man had skipped and left his employees without paying them their wages.

Mr. D. A. CAREY asked for a description of the place.

Inspector BARBER. — I do not know that I could now give you a description of it.

Mr. CAREY. — I just asked for a description simply to understand in what condition the house was and how the work was being carried on.

Inspector BARBER. — I merely mentioned that as something that might be interesting to the Commissioner. There was one place I remember well, on Centre Avenue, at the lower end. It was on a hot day in July or August. The steps were in a dilapidated condition, with a large hole in them. I found several people working upstairs. The place did not look as if it had ever been scrubbed. I told that man that he would have to clean up, and he said he would. He afterwards moved and sent me word to that effect. I found him on Richmond Street in a much better place.

Mr. GUROFSKY.—I do not think that you have the class of people here that could answer that question. You will find that in many of the places that many of the bundles are not only used to sleep on, but to nurse sick children on while the women work at the sewing machines. Of course, in large establishments, such as I work in, where many hands are employed, the clothing is not used for bedding.

The COMMISSIONER.—Do the wholesalers or manufacturers keep themselves informed or make inquiries as to the sanitary condition of workshops or dwellings in which their clothing is manufactured?

Mr. GUROFSKY.—In several years of experience, I never heard of a wholesaler inquiring as to the workshop where their work was done. I doubt whether many wholesalers or foremen ever see the establishments in all their lifetime. People work for them for years and bosses and foreman know nothing of them beyond the street and number of the house in which they reside.

Mr. W. E. TODD.—Where a contractor gives the work to a sub-contractor, how would it be possible for a wholesaler to find out where it was made? It would be an impossibility.

The COMMISSIONER.—I do not think so. If they were anxious to obtain the information, they could.

Mr. GUROFSKY.—They are not very anxious.

Mr. D. J. O'DONOGHUE.—The experience in other countries proves that they can be, and are, compelled by law to know where the work is done, even by the sub-contractor.

Inspector BARBER.—There is no law here to compel them, but I have never been refused when asking for such a list from wholesalers. They have laws in Britain, however, compelling them, as has been said, to know where the work is given.

The COMMISSIONER.—Do the wholesalers or manufacturers take any steps or make any effort to keep themselves informed as to the wages or prices paid by the contractors who do their work, to operators, finishers, pressers or other employees?

Mr. GUROFSKY.—Indeed they do not. It is not any of their funeral at all. They give the contractor a price, and they do not know or care how he gets it done, or where, so long as he brings it back to them.

The COMMISSIONER.—Or as to the prices paid by the contractors to persons to whom they give out work to be done at home?

Mr. GUROFSKY.—I presume the answer is the same as on the previous question, provided the system of so giving out work by contractors is practised.

The COMMISSIONER.—Is there much work given out by contractors to persons who work in their homes?

Mr. GUROFSKY.—Well, Mr. Wright, as far as I know, a few sub-contractors have gone into that part of the work. There is one fellow in particular getting in that work on ladies' work. One on Front Street—Fine is his name—14 Front Street, West. I think—has recently gone into the business. You will find his record in the police court. Not less than fourteen girls left him in one week. Several of them had been in the police court for non-payment of wages. He sub-contracts on all kinds of work. Eatons have also gone into that kind of business.

The COMMISSIONER.—Which Eaton's?

Mr. GUROFSKY.—T. Eaton's. They are making up their ladies' work on that kind of business. They give their people piecework. They contract with the contractor, who gets the rake-off.

The COMMISSIONER.—Eatons get all their work done by contractors, do they not?

Mr. GUROFSKY.—Some of it.

The COMMISSIONER.—Does the practice prevail to any considerable extent among manufacturers or wholesalers, of giving out work directly to people who make it up in their homes?

Mr. GUROFSKY.—They carry that out to a large extent with most of their small work, all children's work goes out in bundles of five, or six or a dozen. To some extent the same thing is carried on in coats of the lower grade and pants. It is only within the last two or three years that two or three pant establishments have started to make

up bundles in large quantities, but the bulk give only three or four to one woman, and in that way send them all over the city.

MR. CAREY.—I know of cases where work is given out from large wholesale houses to manufacturers to the women.

MR. GUROFSKY.—Several large ready made clothing establishments in this city do the same thing, although of course they buy some clothing ready made.

Inspector BARBER.—We suppose that the great bulk of ordered clothing for the trade is done in the same way.

The COMMISSIONER.—That question will come up later. Is it usual for people who make up clothing at their homes, for manufacturers or contractors, to employ assistance not members of their own families?

MR. GUROFSKY.—They always get some one who will work for less than nothing. All have some one to help them.

The COMMISSIONER.—What is the nature of this assistance; are those they employ males or females; adults or children?

MR. GUROFSKY.—They do mostly children's work in the branch shops; very few men work in the branches except in the larger shops. In the wholesale houses young girls come in who want to learn the trade.

The COMMISSIONER.—Are such employees usually paid by the piece, or do they generally work by the day or week?

MR. GUROFSKY.—Myself and those here to-night are all paid by the week, but in some of these places, Eaton's establishment, for instance, they pay them by the piece.

The COMMISSIONER.—Speaking more particularly of employees who work in private houses.

MR. GUROFSKY.—As far as I know both piecework and week work.

The COMMISSIONER.—Are there many shops or places where clothing is made that do not come under the provisions of the Factories Act? I think the statement made by Mr. Brown covers this question.

MR. GUROFSKY.—Hundreds of them.

MR. JURY.—What the Commissioner should do to satisfy himself is to walk up and down Bay Street for a few hours any day in the week and see the great number of women staggering up and down with great bundles of clothing; some of the poor creatures hardly able to walk.

MR. CAREY.—Yes, he would see baby carriages used to carry these bundles.

The COMMISSIONER.—I asked that question largely to make way for the next one. Are there many children employed in such shops or places who are under the Factories age?

MISS CARLYLE.—I do not think so.

Inspector BARBER.—The School Act that we have now requires children between eight and fourteen years of age to go to school and in this city, at least, I think that that law is pretty well enforced.

Inspector BROWN.—I think that it could be regulated. There are many places which do not come under the Act where girls under fourteen are employed.

MR. JURY.—To the Commissioner. Does not your question apply to places that do not come under the Factory Act?

The COMMISSIONER.—Yes, only to such places.

MR. O'DONOGHUE.—I know of my own experience that there are children under age working in the factories.

MR. GUROFSKY.—I could take you to places where the children are making pants with their mothers. These children are under the school age. They are employed sewing on buttons, and the like of that. I know some of the factories where the inspectors go, in which the children work after school hours.

Inspector BARBER.—In those circumstances you ought to let the inspectors know.

MR. GUROFSKY.—They are their own children (the people who run the factories). You might go a dozen times and not see them working there but I might see them any day.

Mr. TODD.—Then the factory inspectors would have some difficulty in locating these cases.

The under age question is a hard one to get at. A gentleman I know—a foreman in a factory where a large number of boys and girls are working—has often told me that boys come to him whom he believes are under age. He tells them that he cannot employ them unless they are over fourteen, and of course they immediately swear that they are over that age. You cannot get the registry of births because not one boy in ten is registered.

Mr. GUROFSKY.—There is a place where you can go to-morrow, a tailor shop on Hagerman Street, where, should they not notice you coming, you will find a whole family of children working.

The COMMISSIONER.—How many hours constitute a day's work in shops where the day or week system obtains?

Mr. GUROFSKY.—As far as our coat shop is concerned where a large number of men are employed, the hours are from 7 to 6 and to 12 o'clock on Saturdays. There was one shop where I worked all hours, where only one or two men are employed. The balance of the employees are girls. The hours are from 7.30 to 6 and to 12 o'clock on Saturdays.

Mr. O'DONOGHUE.—There is one establishment near my place where the hours are from 7.30 to 6 and to 12 o'clock Saturdays.

Mr. GUROFSKY.—The men in my shop have to be there at 7 o'clock, but the girls come in at any time up to 7.30.

The COMMISSIONER.—How many hours daily do piece hands usually work?

Mr. GUROFSKY.—In Eaton's, where they work piecework regularly, the hours are from 8 to 6, but there is a place on Elizabeth Street, where you can go at eleven and twelve o'clock at night and five o'clock in the morning and find them working. They never seem to be doing anything else.

Mr. O'DONOGHUE.—With respect to that place on Elizabeth Street, it appears to me they never sleep. It is on the east side of the street.

The COMMISSIONER.—Do you mean Rosen's place?

Mr. GUROFSKY.—Yes, they are all piece workers there, both men and girls. They do a lot of work for Eaton's.

The COMMISSIONER.—They work for Eaton's pretty much altogether, I think.

Mr. GUROFSKY.—There is another place on Edward street, where they make pants. You can go along there any time and find them working.

The COMMISSIONER.—The place of Rosen's comes under the Factory Act, I think.

Miss CARLYLE.—Yes.

Mr. GUROFSKY.—I don't think that there are six working there now, not including their own family.

The COMMISSIONER.—Still if they have six with their own family that will do.

Mr. O'DONOGHUE.—Speaking in regard to the time in factories, I would just like to ask the inspectors, do they find the Factory Act now very specific so that the question as to what constitutes a day's work and what constitutes overtime cannot be avoided by an employer so desiring? Can employers in their factories now so arrange the work so that night work can be counted as part of the day's work or otherwise? As a manufacturer would it be possible for me to so arrange my men as to run them day and night?

Inspector BROWN.—Have you reference to men alone? because the Act does not apply to men alone.

Mr. O'DONOGHUE.—I am speaking of where the Act does apply, can the employer so arrange his time table?

Inspector BROWN.—So long as he does not make his men exceed sixty hours per week each.

Mr. GUROFSKY.—In Eaton's or any of these large establishments the power is never turned off. The employees eat their dinner in five minutes, put the rest of the meal hour in at work.

Inspector BARBER.—The law definitely fixes sixty hours per week as the working week, and there is no possibility of the employer making any alteration in the forms left him, by which he can exceed those hours.

Mr. O'DONOGHUE.—Can he so arrange so that he can compel girls to work until 10 and 11 o'clock at night.

Inspector BARBER.—Yes, the law does not fix what hours out of the twenty-four they shall work. They can begin at night time or any time, so long as they do not exceed sixty hours per week.

Mr. O'DONOGHUE.—That is what I wanted to know. It does occur at some places and the factory inspector is not to blame. Shrewd men have watched the law and looked into its workings, and are of opinion that it is not altogether satisfactory. It is a fact that some men do work their families after hours at night.

The COMMISSIONER.—But then it would require an amendment to the Act to fix the working hours between certain hours in the day.

Inspector BARBER.—I do not think it is possible to do it. There is a form must be put in each factory to say when they shall begin and when they shall quit. It is ten hours a day, and even if they work full time on Saturday, they must not exceed sixty hours for the week, and must quit at six o'clock Saturday, or otherwise they are liable to prosecution. I do not see how they can get over sixty hours per week without evading the law.

The COMMISSIONER.—I understood Mr. O'Donoghue's question to be one of turning night into day.

Inspector BARBER.—You can work ten hours a day whether in daylight or darkness. Some three or four years ago I received a complaint that the girls in a stereotyping establishment on Melinda Street, were working late at night. I wrote to say that the Factory Act did not interfere so long as the hours were not exceeded. The parties making the complaint were not satisfied and interviewed the Attorney General on the matter and got the same reply from him.

Mr. GUROFSKY.—In the case of a family they might be working until ten o'clock every night.

Inspector BARBER.—That is true enough and strictly speaking not in accordance with the Factory Act but that was made to regulate places employing twenty people or more and certain regulations might be a hardship where less than six people are employed. The law contemplates a little longer working day on ordinary days to shorten the hours on Saturday. It may be somewhat stretching the Factory Act, however, to say that you should work late on Friday to make up lost time.

The COMMISSIONER.—In the case of week or day hands is it usual to have a stint or task set as a day's work?

Mr. GUROFSKY.—It is not necessary. It is not done on principle. The man who takes work to be done on contract knows how many operators, basters, etc., are required. The work is passed through so many hands, each having their own specific work, which has to be done in a certain time or no more work is given out to that party. The whole system works like machinery.

The COMMISSIONER.—I noticed in the evidence given before the United States Congressional Committee that it was said by some witnesses that they had to work away into the second day to make up the first day's work.

Mr. GUROFSKY.—That is often the way in the states. In our own shop we generally manage to finish so many coats a day. The work, however, is so arranged that we start in the morning and finish at night. We have not made a bargain with the boss that we do so many coats a day, yet it is commonly understood that it is to be done. My head man sitting here will bear me out in the statement that we feel if we do not get through there will be trouble.

The COMMISSIONER.—You realize that if it is not done some one else will get your place.

Mr. GUROFSKY.—That's about it.

Mr. SNIDERMAN.—Some days the boss expects too much, then we make a kick. We generally do twenty six coats a day each.

The COMMISSIONER.—Does the system of fining for imperfect or partially spoiled work prevail to any extent?

Mr. GUROFSKY.—They don't call it a fine. If any one spoils work it is the custom of the trade that he has to pay for it, or trot. In some warehouses they make a practice of fining, as you might call it. A woman brings in her work. The foreman says "That does not go" and pretends to find some defect. He checks so much of her money. If she does not take what he gives her he says "There is no more work for you." We understand that it is carried on to a great extent by one warehouse here. The woman might say that she would take the work back and finish it properly, but to this the foreman would say he could not wait, she lived too far away, the work was wanted at once, or some like excuse. Then he would check her three cents or more, as the case may be.

The COMMISSIONER.—Do you get the goods that you spoil?

Mr. GUROFSKY.—Not that I know of. If we spoil a piece worth so much we have to make it good.

Mr. O'DONOGHUE.—Have you the privilege of taking it?

Mr. JURY.—If you spoiled a sleeve you would have to take the whole coat.

Mr. GUROFSKY.—A young fellow working in my shop once spoiled a sleeve and had to pay for it. He did not think it badly damaged and bought some of the same cloth and made himself a coat.

The COMMISSIONER.—What are the usual wages for hands who work by the week?

Mr. GUROFSKY.—For men who are operators—there are not many of us here—the best men get \$11 a week, and the wages run down to \$5 and \$4. This gentleman here (pointing to Sniderman) is the only man in Toronto who gets over \$11 per week. At one time pressers used to get \$2 per day. Now, instead of having one man to press the whole garment they have four. One for the seams one for the collar and so on. They pay these men from \$3 to \$5 per week where formerly one man would do the whole thing and make \$12 per week. He had been paid as low as \$9 per week and as high as \$14.

The COMMISSIONER.—How about the women?

Mr. GUROFSKY.—They run all the way from seventy-five cents.

The COMMISSIONER.—A week?

Mr. GUROFSKY.—Yes, up to \$6, and I doubt if there are half a dozen women earning over \$6. The usual wages is \$3 to \$4.50; but \$3 is a fair wage.

The COMMISSIONER.—Speaking of these girls, are they supposed to know the trade?

Mr. GUROFSKY.—Those earning seventy-five cents know some branch of it.

The COMMISSIONER.—What is the average age of the women employed?

Mr. GUROFSKY.—Oh, all ages—16, 17, 18 and up to 30 years of age.

Mr. O'DONOGHUE.—Do you think that \$4 or \$4.50 is above the average?

Mr. GUROFSKY.—Taking them as a whole I doubt if they would average \$4. I may say that there are five men in my shop. Our average wage is \$12. The girls there average \$4. It has been my experience that in shops where men are employed the wages are higher than where no men are employed. Having the men in the shop has the tendency to increase wages of both girls and men.

Inspector BROWN.—With reference to wages of women. On one occasion I accompanied a reporter to a number of shops in the city making inquiries. I remember one shop where we went and the wages paid ranged from \$1 to \$3.50 per week for a finisher. When asking the employer how they could sustain themselves on such small means he replied that he only got thirty-seven and a half cents each for making coats and could not afford to give any higher wages.

Mr. GUROFSKY.—It is only within a short time that the wages have gone up to the average I mentioned. There has been a scarcity of hands—many having gone over to the United States, and the wages have gone up for those who remain.

The COMMISSIONER.—How about children's wages?

Mr. GUROFSKY.—They generally work for nothing, learning the trade.

The COMMISSIONER.—Is the tendency, as judged by the experience of recent years, toward higher wages or lower?

Mr. GUROFSKY.—I could not do justice to that question. My wages have gone up some recently for the reason I mentioned, a scarcity of hands.

The COMMISSIONER.—For a number of years past what has been the tendency?

Mr. GUROFSKY.—To lower.

Inspector BARBER.—My experience has lasted over some years, and as I have taken an interest in the matter, I have found that the warehousemen were beating down the prices to the contractors; and while many contractors reduce the prices to their workers, in other cases contractors tell me that they were paying the same prices to their workers as formerly and thus losing themselves. Some of these contractors have gone to taking work away from other contractors.

Mr. GUROFSKY.—That is a fair answer to the question.

Mr. JURY.—In 1873-4-5 and 6 just after I first came to Toronto, firms like Robert Walker and R. J. Hunter, both used to make up large quantities of stock work in their slack time. They used to pay \$3.50, \$4 and \$4.50, for their best made overcoats. These men tell me there are no such prices paid now.

Mr. GUROFSKY.—You can get the best stock made coat now for \$1.50 and the money for cotton, etc., comes out of the pockets of the workers.

The COMMISSIONER.—In such divisions of the trade as show tendency to higher wages, does the rise appear to be due to combinations among the employees, to better prices for the finished clothing, or to a scarcity of competent workmen? Or is it to be accounted for in any other way?

Mr. GUROFSKY.—In some instances the tendency has been to increase the wages because there is a scarcity of competent operators. But in the others where there is no lack of finishers, pressers, etc., the wages have gone down. The wages have also gone down in the lower grades of operators. In my branch, wages have gone up owing to the scarcity of competent hands. It is the same way with the girls. A number of experienced girl operators got married recently, that has had the tendency to make the wages of remaining competent girl operators go up.

The COMMISSIONER.—Then I understand your answer to be that in cases of increase in wages in any branch of the work it is due to a scarcity of competent workers in that branch?

Mr. GUROFSKY.—Yes.

The COMMISSIONER.—Where wages have fallen or show a tendency to fall, has it been due to an over supply of workers and resulting competition for employment; to reduced prices of clothing; to the use of improved machinery and appliances; to division of labour and changes in methods of manufacture; to combinations of employers; or to any other specific reason or reasons? Suppose that we deal first with this part of the question—"Has it been due to an over-supply of workers and resulting competition for employment?"

Mr. GUROFSKY.—The prices have come down through contractors. They make particular efforts to draw more people into the trade. Now they have got plenty of men they keep inducing new ones to come in and thus reduce the wages.

The COMMISSIONER.—What about the reduction in the price of clothing?

Mr. GUROFSKY.—The warehousemen cut down the prices right along. The contractor has to make his living, and he in turn has to crush somebody else.

Inspector BARBER.—That depression of wages can be accounted for by the same reason as the rate of wages in other trades. The general depression over America and other parts of the world for the past two or three years. I think myself that is the main cause.

Mr. GUROFSKY.—I know for a fact that if clothing was sold direct from the manufacturer, it would be better. At least 200 per cent goes to the man between.

Inspector BARBER.—Clothing is cheaper.

Mr. GUROFSKY.—Yes, though it may be cheaper, a great deal of the profit goes to other people, there are too many come between.

The COMMISSIONER.—What effect has the introduction of machinery and modern appliances had?

Mr. GUROFSKY.—The contractors in this city are not up to date with regard to machinery?

The COMMISSIONER.—Have the wages been reduced because of machinery?

Mr. GUROFSKY.—No; but the number of men has been reduced. It has replaced hands and thrown them on the market.

Mr. TODD.—Would not that account largely for the general depression? So many working men are thrown out of employment and are pleased to take any kind of work, however ill-paid.

The COMMISSIONER.—What about combinations among employers?

Mr. GUROFSKY.—They have not got any here, in Toronto.

Mr. O'DONOGHUE.—You mean in that particular line—the clothing trade?

Mr. GUROFSKY.—Yes.

Mr. JURY.—Though they have no organization have they not a mutual understanding that they will not pay above a certain price?

Mr. GUROFSKY.—Yes. That is pretty well understood. Generally, the first question asked is, how much did you get at the other place?

The COMMISSIONER.—That of course applies to the contractors?

Mr. GUROFSKY.—Yes.

Mr. CAREY.—Do not the manufacturers—the wholesalers—understand what prices are paid each other?

Mr. GUROFSKY.—They all know pretty well what the other one pays. They try to obtain the information.

The COMMISSIONER.—Is the trade affected by immigration or by transient workmen coming from the United States?

Mr. GUROFSKY.—Last year a lot of them came over here from the United States and we had a surplus of operators of all kinds—all we could get. When trade picked up in the States many went back and the competent ones left here have benefited.

The COMMISSIONER.—Has it been affected by foreign made contracts?

Mr. GUROFSKY.—I cannot tell that.

Mr. TODD.—It happened once in Montreal during a strike that a firm of cigar makers made a contract with a firm in Boston and brought a number of men to Montreal.

The COMMISSIONER.—I remember the case.

Mr. JURY.—A similar case occurred here when the Gurney Manufacturing Company had a strike of their moulders. They went to Albany, engaged a number of moulders and brought them here.

Mr. TODD.—In the case I mentioned the men brought to Montreal were Germans. They were assured that everything was all right and they would get certain wages. When they found that they were to take the places of strikers, they went back on their contract and the majority of them went back to Boston.

Mr. CAREY.—I saw that recently a firm engaged in the bicycle trade, located at Toronto Junction, brought a superintendent and foreman from the United States and engaged them there.

Inspector BARBER.—In London there is a cigar factory making pure Havana cigars. The manufacturer told me that all his cigar makers were imported from Cuba because he believed that the Cubans could turn out a better article and spoil less material in the making than local men.

The COMMISSIONER.—Of course there is nothing in our present laws to prevent a man from coming under contract from another country here to work.

Mr. JURY.—But we have a statute that makes the contract null and void as soon as the "imported" man gets into Ontario.

The COMMISSIONER.—The man can break it certainly. But if he comes into the country without money, he is liable to keep it unless the men out on strike have money to support him.

Mr. O'DONOGHUE.—The intent of the law at the time it was framed was to deal with a class of men who were imported. They are a class in which it is little advantage for a man to get into. They know as a rule what they are being imported for. They state

that it is only on consideration of work at fair wages that they bind themselves to come. Very few of them can be persuaded to go away. We have no law preventing the importation and that to my mind is the most serious phase of the difficulty.

The COMMISSIONER.—Well, at any rate, even if the Ontario law is defective it is as far as the Constitution allows the province to go.

Mr. JURY.—The unions affected by the strikes will support a man if he is willing to break his contract.

Mr. O'DONOGHUE.—In all the cases that have come under my notice for over thirty years these men were justified in breaking the contracts. In every instance they made contracts or were caught, you might say, under contracts by false pretenses.

The COMMISSIONER.—In the shops and other places which do not come under the provisions of the Factories Act, are the conditions usually or often unsanitary?

Miss CARLYLE.—I do not think them very sanitary.

The COMMISSIONER.—If you were to visit a place that did come under the provisions of the Factory Act, but had not proper sanitary conditions, would you consider it a right thing to do to order the conditions to be changed?

Miss CARLYLE.—Yes.

Mr. JURY.—So far as my experience goes, in tailors' back shops, as a rule, there is only one set of sanitary conveniences, for male and female—not private.

Inspector BROWN.—In many cases, as Mr. Jury states, they have only the one convenience, but in other cases there are more than the one convenience, although not belonging to the same factory. I have endeavoured to arrange that there should be one for males and one for females, and that where there is only the one closet, it should be for the use of the females, and rather let the males go out. I went to see one place where the man was just starting in the business. I asked him if he intended to employ females. On his answering yes, I told him that he must not attempt to employ girls until he had a proper convenience for them, and, if he did, I would prosecute him. He moved, and I could not again find him.

Mr. GUROFSKY.—Is that all you mean by the question—just closets?

The COMMISSIONER.—No, it is intended to cover the whole question as to whether the shops are healthy or not.

Mr. GUROFSKY.—There are shops in which gas-irons are burning all the time. There are no attempts at proper ventilation. Morning and night, from twelve to fifteen gas-lights are burning for about two hours, and the stove is going all the time. I have not heard of any establishment being ordered to be properly ventilated. The inspectors look over the closets, but do not see the establishments themselves.

Inspector BARBER.—I suppose that this discussion is not in order. Mr. Gurofsky speaks about ventilation. Of course it is very bad where gas-irons are used, not only in tailor shops but in laundries, and in tailor shops there is no machinery for supplying fans for artificial ventilation. In the winter season especially, there is apt to be an accumulation of foul air. On the other hand, there seems to be only one way to secure proper ventilation—through open windows. There is, however, objection raised by those working near the windows, should they be opened. The people in the centre of the room, of course, would not feel the draught. These are some of the difficulties met with in the matter.

Inspector BROWN.—I have often found the same difficulty that Mr. Barber speaks of. I remember, in one place, asking the men if they had any objections to having the windows opened. These men were working in the centre of the room. They answered, certainly not. The men near the windows did not want them opened.

Mr. GUROFSKY.—I think that there should be ways devised to properly ventilate such establishments. If it could not be done without expensive arrangements, the bosses should be made to go to the expense.

The COMMISSIONER.—The factory inspectors of course are only able to apply the law as it stands.

Mr. CAREY.—Is it not the duty of the Factory Inspector if the conditions are such as will likely be injurious to the health of the people to report them?

Inspector BROWN.—I will tell you of a place: over the Army and Navy stores on King Street. I went into the shop and could hardly breathe for steam, heat and the smell from the gas irons. I could not even see the girls, but that was an exceptional occasion. I've been to the place at other times and found it much better.

Mr. STRACHAN.—If we have a Factory Act it seems to me that it is the duty of the inspectors to see that the rooms they visit are fit for the operations carried on.

Inspector BROWN.—Perhaps you might go to a shop such as I have described at another time and not find the same bad conditions.

Mr. GUROFSKY.—I know of shops not larger than this room in which fifteen people are working there under the conditions I have previously described. The only fresh air that gets into the room comes when some one opens the door to go out into the hall or enters from the hall. I do not think that Dr. Sheurd will say that such a state of things is in accordance with hygienic rules.

The COMMISSIONER.—The one that Mr. Brown speaks of is very much better than the one you describe I should judge. I was in there only the other day and it looked pretty comfortable.

Inspector BARBER.—I rather think that we are encroaching a little on Mr. Wright's time.

Mr. TODD.—I think it is perfectly in order if the general conditions are such as Mr. Gurofsky has described. I think myself it is the duty of the Inspectors to report.

Inspector BARBER.—I have never had a complaint from him concerning any of these places (to Gurofsky) they are so bad you should let the Inspector know.

Mr. GUROFSKY.—I think the lady inspector visited one of them more than once. She does not appear to have done much good.

The COMMISSIONER.—I asked the question because it bears on the next one. Are the larger shops, by reason of having to comply with the provisions of the Factories Act, placed at a disadvantage as compared with these smaller shops?

Mr. O'DONOGHUE.—It is reasonable to suppose that they must necessarily be placed at a very unfair disadvantage.

The COMMISSIONER.—My reason for asking that question was that I can easily understand that we might be able to make out good cause for extending the provisions of the Factory Act. But no Act will be of any use if the employees do not do their fair share in having it enforced.

Mr. GUROFSKY.—It would be as much as any man's job was worth to be found giving information.

Inspector BARBER.—If men who are interested would notify us about their own places before giving us the names of others they would be serving themselves to a good purpose.

Mr. CAREY.—Any man who would do so would be at the disadvantage that by giving information his position would not be worth much to him.

The COMMISSIONER.—Anonymous letters have a standing now.

Mr. CAREY.—Is it right for anonymous letters to be recognized?

The COMMISSIONER.—Yes, under such circumstances I should say they should be.

Mr. CAREY.—I am glad that has been brought out. I did not understand that anonymous letters would be recognized, and I do not think that it was generally known.

Inspector BARBER.—I am told by Mr. Brown that he had a good deal rather that any complaint any person had to make other than about his own shop should come through the Trades and Labour Council.

Mr. O'DONOGHUE.—I think this matter is somewhat out of order. The best thing we can do is to arrange for a meeting some night at which the whole question can be discussed.

Miss CARLYLE.—It has been said that I have been at a particular establishment mentioned but have not accomplished much. The proprietor has his instructions, but we cannot get all done in one day that we would like. If it is not done the man knows the consequences.

Mr. O'DONOGHUE.—I have kept that question in view during the last year. More than one instance has come under my notice of where young women with whom I hap-

pen to be acquainted made complaints as to the places they were working in, justifiable complaints too. It would in my opinion be to the utmost advantage to broaden the scope of the law so as to get at every place not now covered by the Factory Act in the interest of those who were employed.

The COMMISSIONER.—And in the interest of the man who has a factory that does come under the Act.

Mr. O'DONOGHUE.—Yes. It would be to the material advantage of the general health of the community that the scope of the Act should be widened. Where young women are employed they are sensitive about making complaints, and it is only by personal acquaintance and from what other girls have told my own daughters, that I have learned of a condition of thing simply outrageous. But the Factory Act does not reach that condition of things, and I am perfectly satisfied that it would be a material advantage to have it extended because I believe that there are a large number of places where the number of the people employed do not come within the requirements. But in the aggregate these people (families and so on) are greater in number than those where the law does apply.

The COMMISSIONER.—There is no question about that.

Mr. O'DONOGHUE.—Then the aim of the law should be for the good of the greatest number.

The COMMISSIONER.—Are the provisions of the Factories Act satisfactorily enforced, and does the Act give general satisfaction?

Mr. JURY.—I don't think it is hardly fair for the Inspectors to unload themselves upon men who work in the factories. Mr. Barber has told us that he has no difficulty in getting from the wholesalers a list of places where their work is done. Now if he gets such a list from the wholesale men themselves, why cannot he, as one would think it his duty to do, go to these places of his own inclination and see that they conform to the Act. If that is not done, I don't think that it will ever give satisfaction. The mere fact of the Inspector going into Mr. Gurofsky's factory casts suspicion on him (Gurofsky) because he is known as a labour agitator.

Inspector BARBER.—It does not matter to me whether I get my information through a letter signed or anonymously.

Mr. JURY.—Mr. Barber said himself that he could get the names and addresses from the wholesalers of the people who do work for them.

Inspector BARBER.—I have not considered it my duty to do that every year.

The COMMISSIONER.—Probably there is room for more inspectors.

Inspector BARBER.—That is the trouble. I am under the impression that instead of criticising the inspectors, it would be better if some of these workmen would do their share towards letting the inspectors know of any grievances. No one knows so much about it as one who works in it. He should state his grievances, and if not to the inspectors then to the Trades and Labour Council.

Mr. O'DONOGHUE.—In justice to the inspectors, although I agree in the main with what Mr. Jury says, I will say that they have a great deal of ground to cover and difficult work to perform.

Inspector BARBER.—We have.

Mr. O'DONOGHUE.—Other people don't think so apparently, but what I do say in justice to them is that they will look into any case, even if it comes under their notice anonymously; but would prefer that the writers attach their names. If we have complaints to make let us make them.

Mr. TODD.—A great many of these establishments when they are notified—according to the evidence we have heard to-night—that they are in an unsanitary condition, simply move off. It would give the inspectors enormous trouble following them up.

Mr. GURFSKY.—I do not think there are enough inspectors. I made two complaints, in a short time, as secretary of my union. My signature was attached to the letters. If the inspector walks into any clothing shop in this city, I am the one who gets the blame. The shop I am in now is the only one I could get work in. The lady inspector visited that shop one time when I happened to be out. When I returned one of the girls told me of the visit. I asked what the inspector did, and she stated that

she just looked in and without asking any questions went away. She came again. I think she had been there two or three times but the boss took no notice. If there were other inspectors who could come around at more frequent intervals that boss would have to attend to it. I don't complain about the inspectors. I am perfectly satisfied that they do their duty, but there are not enough of them to go around and visit all these places. I don't think the bosses are prosecuted enough. If we had two or three prosecutions we would have a different state of things.

The COMMISSIONER.—Then the answer is practically this—The Factory Act in the opinion of those assembled here ought to be broadened so as to take in smaller shops, and there should be more inspectors.

Several voices.—Yes.

Inspector BROWN.—When the factory inspectors were appointed I was notified by the Commissioner of Public Works that the labour unions were to make known any complaints to the inspectors. There are not enough inspectors to go over the province with justice—and any one with common sense can surely understand that even in the city of Toronto to go and search out these places would take half of the inspectors' time. There are other places besides Toronto to be attended to. When you consider the size of the province you ought to have some little knowledge that a large proportion of the ground cannot be properly covered by us. To ask the inspectors therefore to get a list from wholesalers of people who work for them and then hunt these people up is hardly fair. I tried in one particular season to find out something along those lines in reference to dressmakers. Out of forty places visited I did not meet two that came under the Act. I do not think that it is right to expect inspectors to go trotting around like that. We have other places besides Toronto, and when we are speaking about Toronto it is well to remember in regard to sanitary conditions, that the health officers are entitled to look into this matter just as well as we are. The instructions from the Attorney General are that where the health officers in cities or towns attend to such matters they are to do so, and only in cases where complaint is made to us are we to take notice of them. It is scarcely the thing that we should be expected to trot around and do this.

MR. CAREY.—If the Act as Mr. Brown states implies that only in such cases which come to the inspectors they are to be attended to, then the law should be not only broadened but more definitely understood. You will not get complaints from a man working for a boss, by coming forward to place his name on a piece of paper and coming forward to inform on his employer, because if it comes to be found out he will be dismissed. In the Trades and Labour Council it is but an individual representing all the employees of the shop who makes the statement. But his name is taken down by the press and he becomes responsible. If the inspector goes into a shop and speaks to a man or woman that one is pointed out as the one who gave the information. My understanding is that the inspectors ought to visit factories and workshops, and if the conditions are not such as they should be it would be their duty to insist upon their being made so. I think the duties of inspectors are not thoroughly understood. And while this discussion is a little way from the point, the information being brought out might be well used, because the Act is not at all satisfactory from what has been said here to-night. It requires either that the men who make the complaint will be protected by law or an increase of inspectors. While labour organizations are not in favour of more inspectors, I think myself that you can get enough information here to make a request to the government to so amend the Act as to make it more applicable to all parties concerned.

The COMMISSIONER.—Do I understand that it would be likely to be the case that the labour bodies would object to the appointment of more inspectors?

Mr. O'DONOGHUE.—No, but they are opposed to the creation of unnecessary officers. I understand that in Britain children under a certain age before being allowed to work in a factory must have reached a certain standard in school, and I think that any child found in a factory who cannot read or write should be compelled to go to school.

Mr. JURY.—I think it would be well to have a provision of that kind. It is easy for inspectors—and I say this advisedly—to shirk their duties by putting the onus on the shoulders of the workmen. But I go into a factory as the friend of the fore-

man or some of the employees. I see little boys running around whom I am positive are under age. In this connection Mr. Jury instanced the glass factory at Hamilton. I don't want to play the part of the spy and lodge information against a place I visited as a friend. They would have some reason to blame me, knowing that I am interested in labour movements. These men are appointed to inspect and report, and it seems to me that it is their duty to go and inspect. Not to wait for private information, but to go and look after the places themselves.

Mr. STRACHAN.—I don't think it is right to use the Trades and Labour Council as a tool of information. I don't think that it would be the duty of that board to become informers.

The COMMISSIONER.—I understand Mr. Barber to mean that where a man does not like to give the information direct, he can give it through the Trades and Labour Council.

Mr. STRACHAN.—I don't think that would be right.

Mr. GURFESKY.—As soon as the inspector goes into a tailor shop they immediately charge me with being the informer. Any prominent man in the union—in other trades—will be immediately charged. If you had more inspectors and more visitors they would know that the inspectors visited their establishments because it was their turn.

Inspector BARBER.—It has been said that this is an open meeting. I don't know whether any one here is reporting for the papers or not. If so, I hope they will not use names, as a name has been mentioned in connection with a letter making complaint, and I would not like any one to get into trouble over it. As to Mr. Jury's remarks, on the 1st of July last the new law came into force, that children under 14 years of age must not be employed. I am prepared to say that within the last five years no children under the age have been employed in the glass factories. There has been a certain amount of hostility to the inspectors, and people have been apt to make rash statements that they could not back up.

Mr. CAREY.—Speaking of open meetings and Mr. Barber's statements as regards reporters, I was simply referring to meetings of the Trades and Labour Council which are public and attended by press representatives. Now, I know for a positive fact that there are men working in the glass factory in Hamilton, who will give their names—and some in Toronto—who will make their statements on oath that there are children working in the glass factories who are not yet fourteen years of age. I am not going to blame the inspectors for this. I will give you another instance, and this is coming home to individuals closely connected with myself. I went to the parents of a boy who was at work and whom I knew to be under age. I told them that they must take him away and send him to school, or I would have them compelled. They did so. The employers are not to a great extent to blame. They are in the same position as the inspector in that connection. It is the parents who are to blame for falsifying the age of the child.

Inspector BARBER.—I have recently visited the glass factory at Burlington twice, and on neither occasion was a boy less than 14 years old employed. I have been told in Hamilton that the worst people to sneak in child labour were the glass blowers themselves. They would sneak in their children in direct violation of the Act.

Mr. JURY.—Then it has been done.

Mr. CAREY.—I would just like to say that if the inspector finds that state of things he should punish the men belonging to the labour unions, for they are as much to blame as any one.

Inspector BROWN.—I must say that I have found some of the labour people themselves giving false certificates. In one case in the city of Kingston I got two false certificates from one man. I got at the truth simply by chance. The papers were given me one after the other, and in looking over them I found that one child was declared to have been born in the month of November, 1878, and the other in December of the same year. I went to the man's residence and saw his wife. I asked if they had the names of the children in the family Bible. She suspected what was up, and I had to find the Bible for her and there I found the correct ages; showing that neither were of age. I told her to send her husband to me. He came that night. He was a

member of a labour organization. I said you are one of those who wanted to have the Factory Act put into operation, and here you are giving false certificates. "Well" said he "some of the people said you would not be around for a long time again, and it would be all right." I said that I would report the matter, and I did. The Attorney General said it was a bad case, but as the man was then out of work it was overlooked. Of course, I think it was the best thing that could be done, as he promised positively not to transgress again. A great many give false certificates. A great many children have never been registered at all, and that is a great obstacle to getting at the age. When they are over 14, no certificates are required at all. If any employer sees to it that the children are of age and gets a certificate from the parents then he is trying to carry out the provisions of the Act, but if he chooses to accept the simple statement, then he is liable as well as the parents. I may say that I prosecuted two parents for allowing children to go to work who were under age--after previously warning them. But the trouble is, of course, that the parent is liable as well as the employer and if you take the one you have to take both.

The COMMISSIONER.—Is it the experience of manufacturers or wholesalers that they can get their work done as well or better and more cheaply by contractors than they could in factories of their own?

Mr. GUROFSKY instanced a firm of manufacturers in Rochester that had done away with contractors and were doing their work direct in their own warehouse. They are, he said, well pleased with the new order of things. I do not think there is anything of this here.

The COMMISSIONER.—Have there been any authenticated instances of contagious diseases having been spread by means of garments made in contractors' shops or private houses? Mr. Gurofsky has spoken of that.

Mr. GUROFSKY.—I worked in a shop in this city where two children died of diphtheria. There were both men and women in the establishment. The man (father of children) used to come down stairs and work in the shop after he had been with the children. We did not know that it was diphtheria until one child died and the other was taken to the hospital. Then the authorities notified us and put a placard upon the door.

The COMMISSIONER.—Do you actually know of any case wherein infectious diseases were carried by means of garments?

Mr. GUROFSKY.—Well, no.

The COMMISSIONER.—I noticed that in the examination before the sweating commission in the United States, this question was asked from different witnesses. Different answers were given—whether the sponging and pressing of garments would kill the germs of disease? Some thought that it would; others that it would not.

Inspector BARBER.—There could be no doubt that the heat of the pressing irons would kill the microbes.

Mr. GUROFSKY.—I know of girls working in shops who have consumption and other diseases of that kind.

Mr. STRACHAN.—Disease was liable to be contracted in private houses where poverty, sickness, and oftentimes filth reigned. No dwelling-house, he thought, should be allowed to become a factory.

Mr. CAREY.—If that were the case the inspectors would have a better opportunity of getting at the trouble.

Inspector BARBER.—The medical health officer deals with that.

The COMMISSIONER.—I came across a case where scarlet fever was in the house.

Mr. STRACHAN.—Work was taken to private houses where mothers employed girls. When there were cases of sickness the clothing was used for bedding, etc. Sweating is the great difficulty. No work should be allowed to be done in private houses. I hope that the report which you will present, Mr. Commissioner, will bring in a new state of things altogether, and a new system of inspection in these private residences. Such a condition of things as would answer to the factory. That diseases are spread by clothing I think there can be no doubt. It is the sweating system that you want to get at the bottom of.

The COMMISSIONER.—I don't suppose that if I were to-night to ask the question, "what constitutes sweating?" that I would get two answers alike.

Mr. Todd.—In reference to your former question, to which you had a good deal of difficulty in getting an answer, because the parties directly interested are not here. You see people use a great deal of caution to prevent information getting outside about infectious diseases in their houses. Instances are known where contagious diseases are concealed. We know, however, that clothing will carry infection and from the fact that much of this clothing is made up in close and ill-ventilated places where disease would have a chance to spread there is no question at all but that it has carried contagious disease. A great many cases can be traced which spring from that. I think if you look over the reports from other commissions you will find that where they have had a more extended field they have been able to answer that question.

Mr. O'Donoghue.—It is not a fair assumption that no cases arise simply because we don't know of them.

The COMMISSIONER.—Only if I had the particular instance, it would be more satisfactory. Now, in reference to this investigation. I have only ninety days altogether in which to get the information, and consequently cannot make so thorough an investigation as I think should be made with reference to wages. I shall only be able to speak generally. To attempt in a ninety-days' investigation to get at all the facts relating to this trade, or any trade, would be useless. It simply could not be done. It seems to me that the bureau of labour statistics, to establish which an Act has been passed, but which has never been put into operation, cannot be organized any too soon. We ought to have such information as it would give, readily to hand. Other countries have such bureaus, and in the United States they not only give statistics of their own, but for other countries.

Mr. O'Donoghue.—If you could take a consensus of the opinions of those who take an active part in matters connected with labour, I think you would find no enemies to it. We think the Government would be justified in putting that bureau into operation. We were expecting much from it, and much good would rise from it were it put into operation. Even now it is better late than never, and we would be proud to get it. We are proud of Canada for many reasons, but that happens to be one of the things in which we think the country is behind. If the Government of the country exercises economy in every other direction, they can afford to give us a bureau of that character. It would be a great advantage to the working people and the country as a whole, because incidentally and indirectly much of the information in the hands of the Canadian people would be laid before the world.

The COMMISSIONER.—As the hour is late (it was now 10.50 p.m.) we will adjourn to meet again at this place to-morrow evening, when we will again give the matter our best attention.

Mr. GUROFSKY.—Can we ask contractors to come?

The COMMISSIONER.—We want all to be present who can give any information whatever on the matter. I may say that contractors, as well as wholesale manufacturers, were invited, and I have the promise of the contractors that they will be represented by a committee to-morrow night. You will each understand that you have the right to personally invite any who can throw any light upon the matters under investigation.

The inquiry then adjourned.

The inquiry resumed on Thursday, the 9th January, 1895, at 8.20 p.m.

A number of contractors were present in addition to representatives of the labour organizations.

The COMMISSIONER.—Gentlemen, in answering questions, you will please as nearly as possible confine yourself to the question. Last night we got into a discussion on the

Factory Act, and although on the whole profitable, it took up time which should have been given to other matters, and we have no time to go over all the phases of the question.

I will first repeat the last question put last evening, as possibly there may be present to night some who can throw further light upon it.

Have there been any authenticated instances of contagious diseases having been spread by means of garments made in contractors' shops or private houses?

Mr. LOVE.—I know of no cases in Toronto at any rate.

The COMMISSIONER.—I was told of two cases of scarlet fever in a house where clothing was made, but do not know that any bad results came from it, although that might easily be.

Mr. W. MACKEY.—I don't quite understand what you're driving at. I thought that it was the hours of work and the wages that we paid that you wanted to know. I did not come here to learn anything about diseases. I am going to tell you the hours that I work and these other gentlemen can do the same and who we employ, how long we've been in the trade, and how long hands work for us.

The COMMISSIONER.—That is all very well, then, we will be glad to have it. You understand that we want to get at the facts in the trade as far as possible. If there is any question left unasked that you want to have asked, or if you have any information whatever that you want to give us, we will be only too glad to have you do so.

Mr. MACKEY.—Well, we begin at half past seven in the morning, get an hour for dinner and quit at six as the bell rings. We quit at twelve o'clock Saturdays. My hands earn from one dollar per week—that is for little apprentices over fourteen years of age of course—to seven dollars per week. I have had them for over ten years in my employment. The men I have get from five to twelve dollars per week.

The COMMISSIONER.—Then the first figures you gave were in reference to girls.

Mr. MACKEY.—Yes; a little girl apprentice would get one dollar a week to begin with. I defy any man to contradict that, and the wages run up to seven dollars per week.

The COMMISSIONER.—About the men, please give the figures.

Mr. MACKEY.—They will get from five to eight, and from eight to twelve dollars. That is what I pay and that is all I have to say.

Mr. GUROFSKY.—Would it be fair to ask the last witness a question? He said he had paid six dollars, but now pays his lowest man five dollars and his highest twelve. How many men has he at twelve dollars and how many girls at seven and how many at from two to four dollars?

Mr. MACKEY.—I could not just exactly give an off-hand answer to that question.

The COMMISSIONER.—(To Mr. Mackey) You stated that you could not give the answer to that question off-hand. Will you give it to me if I call at your place?

Mr. MACKEY.—With pleasure.

The COMMISSIONER.—What kind of garments are mostly made up under the contract system?

Mr. MACKEY.—All I make is coats.

The COMMISSIONER.—But I suppose pants and nickers also.

Mr. MACKEY.—Oh, certainly.

The COMMISSIONER.—Mr. Love, I think you work on overcoats largely do you not?

Mr. LOVE.—All kinds of coats according to seasons.

Mr. SNIDERMAN.—The bosses need not be afraid to tell all they know, 'tis for their own benefit.

Mr. LOVE.—I am glad of that and thank this gentleman for his kindness. I do not think from the look of the man that I would be very much afraid of him. But we are here to give all the information requisite as far as we can, if it is going to be of any benefit to the trade and to give it intelligently. I hope there will be no falling out about what has been. It is a mistake for the speakers to attack each other personally.

The COMMISSIONER.—We need not ventilate anything of that kind; we are here to get information for the good of the trade. I have only got the answer for coats but I presume that it applies to pants and nickers.

Mr. LOVE.—I can tell you for a positive fact that there are pants being made in the city of Toronto at ten cents per pair.

The COMMISSIONER.—In the contract shops?

Mr. LOVE.—Well, the wholesale men give them out and get them back finished for that money.

The COMMISSIONER.—The question was asked last night as to the practice of wholesale men giving out goods directly to the people.

Mr. LOVE.—The wholesale manufacturer gets pants made in Toronto for ten cents a pair that I know of. Twelve cents per pair was some time ago the cheapest that I had ever known, but now they are down to ten cents. I saw no later than this week two or three dozen pair of pants that were made at ten cents, and I was told that even at that price that they were running—breaking their necks you might say—to get the work. Even at that price the men could not supply them fast enough.

The COMMISSIONER.—I would like if you would give me the name not for publication of course.

Mr. LOVE.—I will give it to you. This man told me that he had to compete with other people. He said that others were cutting him down cheaper than that. As to that, however, I cannot say.

The COMMISSIONER.—Can any one tell me anything about the contract system outside of the clothing trade?

Mr. LOVE.—I don't know outside of my own. I suppose there are other trades running the same way.

Mr. STRACHAN.—When I understand you to say that there are pants made for ten cents a pair, does that mean that they are issued from the warehouses to employers?

Mr. LOVE.—No, they are issued by the wholesale men to the contractors—the makers as you term them—I don't know whether the contractors make a second contract or not, but I know that the pants are finished and delivered for ten cents a pair.

Mr. STRACHAN.—Are you aware of any individual giving a contract that goes to a second or sub-contractor?

Mr. LOVE.—I am not aware of any of that trade being done in Toronto.

Mr. O'DONOGHUE.—Does the ten cents include any of the material, thread, buttons, etc.?

Mr. LOVE.—No, sir, everything is supplied.

The COMMISSIONER.—In the case you refer to, what does the work amount to?

Mr. LOVE.—In coats they are first cut after the pattern, then those who take them out pay the carriage and bring them back made.

The COMMISSIONER.—The question was asked last night as to whether the fining system obtained in wholesale houses to any extent.

Mr. LOVE.—I never knew it to be done.

The COMMISSIONER.—You did not spoil any cloth?

Mr. LOVE.—I will not say that. I must say that I think it right that if clothing is spoiled to any extent by burning it should be paid for.

The COMMISSIONER.—What I mean by the fining system is this: It has been frequently complained of that employers make a practice of arbitrarily fining beyond the damage done.

Mr. LOVE.—I'm not aware of it. I don't know that I've heard of it as far as the contractors are concerned. I never did it, and none of the men here ever did it.

Mr. DAVIS.—As far as these questions are concerned I can give a little information about them myself. Mr. Love has told you about pants being made at ten cents a pair. I may tell you that there are coats being made for twenty cents and there are pants made in the city of Toronto at sixty cents per dozen in coarse lines. It would be hard to explain to you who are not in the trade about the different lines. These pants are lined right through, have two pockets and women are taking them out and making them at sixty cents per dozen pairs.

The COMMISSIONER.—Does that include anything beyond the making, thread or anything?

Mr. DAVIS.—I know of one place where they have to find their own thread. At that same place I have seen them waiting probably two hours to get a half dozen pairs and they bring them back the next day in baby buggies and probably have several children to look after as well. Then the foreman will pick out four pair and complain that they are not enough finished, and the woman has either to do the work over again or be fined. What I say about the sweating system is that the hands working in our shops are far better off than those going direct to the manufacturer. When a girl comes to my shop whatever she gets I see that she gets it, although I cannot afford to pay much. I have been in the business in this city twelve years. I have paid as high as sixteen dollars per week. Now, if I had to pay nine dollars per week I could not afford it. When I paid higher I was making more. Now, some of the weeks I am running behind. I cannot always pay just when the wages are due. They have to wait a day or two sometimes, but they always get paid up.

Mr. O'DONOGHUE.—What is the cause of that from your standpoint?

Mr. DAVIS.—The cause—too many in the trade.

The COMMISSIONER.—I think I see the drift of Mr. O'Donoghue's question. How do the prices at which the goods are ultimately sold compare now with what they were?

Mr. DAVIS.—They don't get half as much for the goods now as they did six years ago. Competition in the trade and too much labour does it. I have refused coats at 37½ cents, because I told them it was impossible to take them out and get them done at that price. I then found myself without any work in, and I made up my mind that I would try them, so I went back to the manufacturers, but was told that they were gone. That shows that it is not the manufacturers or middlemen who are to blame, but it is the fault of the hard times. People are anxious to get anything at all to do.

Mr. O'DONOGHUE.—You made the remark that people employed by the contractors were better off than those dealing direct with the wholesalers.

Mr. DAVIS.—They don't run any chances, if they do the work all right. If it is not done right they alter it in the shop, and there is very little blame from it. There is a chance for me getting a hundred of goods back, because they are not done just the way they should be. I bear the cost. The man or girl in my place does not run any responsibility. Besides that they don't have to take bundles through the streets and wait at the wholesalers for hours to be attended to. There is one place I know of where they pay the people on a little bit of a staircase. The pay day is on Friday, and you can number a hundred or more gathered there to get paid. Even in the coldest weather many of them have to wait two hours for their turn.

Mr. O'DONOGHUE.—You say that they are more liable when dealing with the manufacturer direct to lose for the reason that if a large number of goods from your establishment do not suit you have to put them right.

Mr. DAVIS.—Yes. My hands are getting paid even for overtime. The men start in at 7 o'clock in the morning, and the girls at 7.30. They quit at 12 for an hour, then work to six. They stop at 12 on Saturdays. They get their week's pay no matter what happens.

Mr. O'DONOGHUE.—They are working by the week.

Mr. DAVIS.—Yes. The only sweating system is where the women are taking out direct from the manufacturers.

The COMMISSIONER.—I might say that I had a letter from one who paid great attention to the sweating system in the States. It stated that the trouble was the people try to throw the blame on the contractor as well as the wholesale men, while the writer considered the wholesaler the greatest sweeter of the two.

Mr. GURFSKY.—You might infer from what has been said that hands are better off working for contractors than for warehousemen. They might be better off than if taking the work to their homes, but they are not better off than if working for the warehousemen.

The COMMISSIONER.—That is working in the warehouseman's own factory?

Mr. GURFSKY.—Yes. Don't draw the inference that we are better off working for a contractor than we would be working for the warehousemen.

Mr. O'DONOGHUE.—(To Gurofsky) Would you get more wages direct from the warehousemen than at the place where you are now working?

Mr. GUROFSKY.—I am satisfied that I would. I had the experience not long ago. I was working for the T. Eaton Co., and made eighteen and twenty dollars a week. That company learned a little something. They took a contractor in and gave him the work. The result was that he got a big rake off. The most a man can earn there now is twelve to thirteen dollars a week. For that reason I believe that we would be better off working for the manufacturer direct. There would be no middlemen taking anything off. Take the firm of W. R. Johnstone for instance. They employ ten or eleven contractors. Each boss has a number of hands that might possibly be done away with if they were all in one establishment. It would be less expense with regard to heating, lighting, power, etc., and instead of ten or eleven men supervising as many establishments, three or four men as foremen would do the work, and save the price of eight men, and the rake off would go to the people employed and it would not cost the warehouseman one cent more to manufacture his stuff.

The COMMISSIONER.—What object then have the wholesale men in giving their goods out to contractors?

Mr. GUROFSKY.—They rid themselves of the responsibility. They used to work inside. A large firm in Rochester recently had difficulty with their contractors. They went to work and started to manufacture on their own premises and they find it to work splendidly. Another firm in New York and one in Chicago have adopted the same plan with great success.

The COMMISSIONER.—The point I want to get at is this: If you are correct in what you say, it seems to me that it would be easy for the men to persuade the wholesalers that it would be in their interests to run their own shops instead of employing contractors. Last night I asked the question whether it pays best to have work done by contractors or in their own shops.

Mr. GUROFSKY.—But these men have no experience. Mr. Love knows nothing about that. The only way to get an answer would be to go to that firm in Rochester and get their experience and also to Alexander & Anderson and the T. Eaton Co.

The COMMISSIONER.—The hardest thing to get in Rochester is the truth. I could not get it.

Mr. LOVE.—His own words (indicating Gurofsky) condemn themselves. He says that in the T. Eaton Co., he could make \$18 per week. The company either paid him more than he was worth or found contract labour the best. I am in favour of day's wages. Once when they could not get work, Mr. Gurofsky got some of his friends who had a little money and started a shop of their own which was not a success. If they're working inside they would just do as other piece workers have done who worked night and day until the bosses would say that they were making too much money and cut them down. My experience both in the old country and in this country is that if piece hands would do just an ordinary day's work there would not be such low wages. I was one to inform the police that he (Mr. Gurofsky) worked on Sundays even. He was not satisfied with doing six days' work but did it on the seventh.

Mr. GUROFSKY.—I don't ask the man who has the confidence of the bosses to judge me. I am content to have the confidence of my co-workers. If they want my defence they can have it. Mr. Love has not drawn a fair inference. The cause of the contractor being called in at Eaton's was the unfortunate squabble amongst the hands. There was too much favouritism. They quarrelled among themselves and the firm getting tired of that called in a middleman who gets a large rake off and rids them of responsibility. The reason I could not make the shop referred to go was because I could not grind the men down like the contractors. We did start a co-operative establishment, but as I have said we could not grind each other down as the bosses grind us down and we had to give it up.

The COMMISSIONER.—When you had the co-operative establishment there was no question of wages involved of course.

Mr. GUROFSKY.—No; but when the week's end came there was no money left. We could have succeeded as well as any in the business by grinding the faces of the people as they do now.

The COMMISSIONER.—In the co-operative establishment I presume all the men who worked in the shop shared the profit.

Mr. GUROFSKY.—Yes; and we paid the girls. There was nothing in it because the warehousemen would not pay enough.

Mr. DAVIS.—Did you get less than now?

Mr. GUROFSKY.—No; we got all there was in it, but we had to pay hands.

The COMMISSIONER.—Then these gentlemen get only what you got. You then had no "rake off" to pay to middlemen, yet you could not make wages.

Mr. GUROFSKY.—We had no girls at less than four dollars per week. We employed no apprentices, and the least we paid was four dollars.

Mr. DAVIS.—How many girls?

Mr. GUROFSKY.—I cannot recollect, but they all got pay, and you can see the books if you want to.

Mr. SNIDERMAN said that they did not pay bigger prices in the wholesales because of the competition between the contractors.

The COMMISSIONER.—They try to beat each other.

Mr. SNIDERMAN.—Yes.

Mr. GUROFSKY.—The man we are working for got some coats to do at a dollar and a quarter, and Mr. Love came and took them for a dollar.

Mr. Love denied that this was the case.

Mr. O'DONOGHUE.—If you're going to get to squabbling you will waste the Commissioner's time. I would like to see personalities left out of the matter.

Mr. LOVE.—I must contradict that misstatement. Mr. Gurofsky tells what is not true. Let Mr. Gurofsky state what pay he gets now. He and another machine are doing thirty coats a day.

Several of those present started to talk at one time.

The COMMISSIONER.—Gentlemen, I must insist upon having order. Try and give a straight answer to the question or we will never get through.

Mr. STRACHAN.—This gentleman has come here for the purpose of an inquiry into the sweating system. I think that any man who takes out work from the wholesale and gets it done through middlemen is a sweater.

The COMMISSIONER.—You must understand what the Government wants is to get information as to the sweating system itself and to see what can be done to check it, if anything can be done.

Mr. LOVE.—There is one suggestion I would like to make. There are a lot of irresponsible men go into the middlemen's place. They take out work at any figure the wholesaler likes to give. They do not pay their hands for a week or two and at the end of that time they skip out leaving the poor workers in the lurch. I have suffered through that kind of thing myself. Something should be done to check this. As far as sweating goes, my idea is that there's not a tailor in the city, custom or wholesale, who is a sweater.

Mr. STRACHAN.—The man you represent is simply a fraud if he skips away leaving his employees in the lurch. But what is a sweater but a man who employs labour and takes that labour from another? I call those clothing manufacturers sweaters.

The COMMISSIONER.—Similar investigations have been held in various countries and in looking over the reports for the definition of a sweater, I don't find that the evidence of any two witnesses agree on that point.

Mr. LOVE.—All contractors are sweaters in that sense and it is the only one that you can see it in.

Mr. STRACHAN.—The man standing between the middleman and the sweating system is the curse of Toronto.

The COMMISSIONER.—Mr. Strachan, according to your view, the contractor is a sweater. Is he the only one? Is the wholesale man a sweater or not?

Mr. STRACHAN.—The warehouseman goes to Europe and purchases goods there. He takes a web of cloth and says I want twenty coats made out of that, and to the contractor he says I will give you so much to make them. The contractor says it is too

little. Then the warehouseman threatens to give the work to another. The contractor immediately gives in and he will get the rake off between himself and the workshop.

The COMMISSIONER.—How much is the rake-off for the warehouseman?

Mr. STRACHAN.—Nothing, it has gone to the contractor.

The COMMISSIONER.—Yet you say he would have paid a dollar and a half for a coat but for the competition among the sweaters.

Mr. LOVE.—I would like to say that I don't know of a firm or sweater in Toronto paying hands by piece-work. They are all on day's wages. There are no contractors in the second term amongst what you call the sweaters who have been in Toronto for a number of years. Small or large all pay day's wages.

The COMMISSIONER.—I have run across some who have changed from piece to day work.

Mr. STRACHAN.—It does not cease to be piece work simply because they pay day's wages, for when a man gets a certain number of coats to do he has to finish them within a stated time or go. The bosses know the value of a man yet cut the wages down. (To Mr. Love.) You say that at one time you paid as high as fourteen dollars.

Mr. LOVE.—I never stated that. I never paid more than eleven.

Mr. STRACHAN.—He did.

Mr. GROSSKY, Mr. STONG and Mr. LOVE all began a heated argument which was promptly suppressed by the Commissioner.

Mr. LOVE.—I perfectly agree with the statements made that wages are being broken down but that arises from competition. Would Mr. Strachan be fool enough to keep a girl working for six dollars when he could get a better one for four? I don't think he would be fool enough to give any girl a present of two dollars per week. I may say that I have paid as low as one dollar. I generally give that to a little girl apprentice. She must be of the factory age. I take her in for the first three months and pay one dollar per week. She helps to keep the place clean and also learns to sew, because the majority of girls in this country at that age don't even know how to hold a needle. Seven dollars per week is the highest I ever paid to a girl and the highest that any man taking out work can afford to pay, and she must be an extra good girl at that. My experience is that from three and a half to four dollars is a good average. I had a grocery store in this city not long ago and a girl came to me and offered her services for two and a half dollars per week, although her hours were longer in that store than those of any girl tailoring for me. They quit rigidly on time and a little before if they can and you can say the same of the men. I consider on the whole that the girls in Toronto who work for respectable sweaters are better paid and have a better time than the general run of girls.

The COMMISSIONER.—I asked this question last night which you now can probably answer. Are the large shops such as yours which come under the regulations of the Factory Act placed at a disadvantage—by reason of complying with these provisions—as compared with smaller shops?

Mr. LOVE.—I am not aware that they are. Every shop of course comes under the Factory Act if one outside help is employed.

The COMMISSIONER.—No, a shop does not come under the Factory Act unless there are six employees. Under that Act the regulations are more stringent than in places which don't come under it. I wanted to know if the competition of these shops injured the larger shops.

Mr. LOVE.—I am not aware of it.

Mr. SANGSTER.—There's one little point to which I want to draw your attention. Mr. Davis maintained that the employees working for the contractor have not the responsibility attaching to them that they would have if dealing directly with the manufacturer. Now, I contend that the responsibility attaching to the employees is just as great if not more so, because the contractor must see that the work is properly done before he accepts it, and I don't see where the point of responsibility comes in at all.

The COMMISSIONER.—You remember last night that the remark was made where a woman would take in a bundle of clothing the foreman would say it is not up to the mark and find this or that fault with it. When she would offer to take it back she

would be told that it was wanted at once and would be fined or checked for whatever amount the foreman saw fit to impose upon her. Mr. Davis maintained that that would not follow were the woman working for a contractor.

Mr. SANGSTER.—No, because the contractor would see that it was right before it left his shop.

The COMMISSIONER.—Mr. Davis maintains that if he takes a hundred coats from a warehouseman, he will have his own idea as to how they are to be made up. If, when he takes them back to the warehouse, fault is found with them, and he has to make alterations, it is he who has to bear the expense, but if the employees take them back, they would have to bear the expense.

Mr. SANGSTER.—If a woman can work for a contractor satisfactorily, she can do the same for a warehouseman.

Mr. GUROFSKY.—If the hands were working piece work for Mr. Davis, he would say that they were just as responsible to him as the contractors are to the warehousemen. There is one man in this city gives all his hands piece work, the man Fine I told you of. He makes knickers, coats, ladies' blouses, jackets and all kinds of work. We have to pay, if we spoil anything. I have had to pay, and I know others who have. I have had to pay Mr. Davies once or twice, I believe.

The COMMISSIONER.—Let's get down to the point. Suppose that you took work from the warehouse and took it back from your shop finished according to their instructions. Supposing then that the warehouseman found fault with it, saying he wanted it made so and so. Would the contractor have to bear the expense?

Mr. GUROFSKY.—No, he would be paid for it; but if he did not make it according to instructions, he would have to pay for it. When I was working by the piece, I would have to make it right if I spoiled anything.

The COMMISSIONER.—These gentlemen say their work is day work.

Mr. SIMONS.—Mr. Gurofsky said that if a workman spoils anything, he would have to pay for it. I have worked for Mr. Davis for some time, and I have occasionally spoiled goods, but have never had to pay for them.

Mr. DAVIS.—I would not say that if a man goes and deliberately destroys a garment, or if two men get fighting and tear a garment, that I would stand the consequences. But if I find fault with the way a sleeve hangs, for instance, and make my man take it out and fix it properly, that is done at my expense.

Mr. O'DONOGHUE.—In connection with the discussion on this matter, I would like to say that the British Government, as a whole and by departments, has done away with the sub-contract system. Every department of the British Government now has a specification in its contracts that he who gets the work must say what wages he is going to pay for every item during the time that he has the contract. Because the experience there, which was larger than any one of you or all of you put together, was, that the middleman was in every instance an injury to the person who made the garment. I am satisfied that that is the case. I say that what has been found justifiable by the British Government in this matter would be a good pattern for us in Canada to follow.

Mr. GUROFSKY.—There is one question I would like to ask Mr. Love. He said that the girls in the clothing trade were better off on the average than those outside. I would like to ask him if it is as healthy as any other trade. Is it not detrimental to the health of the girls?

The COMMISSIONER.—You'd better leave that question until we come to it. To what extent does the contract system prevail in the custom or ordered trade. I know that in the case of pants made to order the work is done largely by contract.

Mr. DAVIS.—Even in coats, too.

Mr. STRACHAN.—You were asking the question in regard to the custom trade.

The COMMISSIONER.—Yes. Does the contract system prevail in that trade?

Mr. STRACHAN.—There are a hundred and forty men and fifty women out on strike at this moment. Why are they there? Because the nineteen employers—good men, too, apparently—told us that they wanted the power over the pant and vest hands to do as they like. They found it so convenient that instead of paying two dollars for custom made pants they were getting them made for sixty-eight cents or one dollar. Eight

years ago I knew a shop where they paid two dollars per pair for pants. We have struck to support these people because the contractors are just grinding them down. We want as a union to control this labour, and to aid the girls in the pant and vest departments. The employers said we will pay \$1.50 and \$1.25 for vests and you not interfere, but if we did not interfere these girls would soon be doing the work for fifty cents. We will fight this thing. The only way to prevent it is to make employers of labour do away with back shops and employ without contract. This system of spreading the work all over the city and putting one human being against the other is wrong. During the present strike a tailor who wished to get an overcoat completed for which he would probably get thirty dollars, sent it up to one of the establishments to see if the men would do it. They (the strikers) went and got the coat and sent it back. They are trying to break our power to earn a livelihood. These men would not care if the women prostituted their bodies at night to make a living wage. You must make employers do away with back shops. These contractors are all sweaters. If they would unite and go to the warehouseman and say we will not work at the prices you offer us; they are too low; then they would be able to pay girls and men living wages. Instead of that each man tries to cut the price. I hope we will fight this thing to the end.

Mr. LOVE.—And I hope that the wholesale trade will give you all the assistance which they can, but I know for a fact that these same custom men are getting their coats made by wholesale men. This gentleman (referring to Mr. Strachan) says that we have ourselves to blame for making coats so cheaply. That is going a little beyond the truth. We have no more control over that than he has for the simple reason that when there is a surplus of men there will always be competition.

Mr. STRACHAN.—Is there a surplus of contractors?

Mr. LOVE.—Why, yes. It requires no experience. Anybody can get into it.

The COMMISSIONER.—I think we all agree with Mr. Strachan that if the men and contractors only united they could settle a great many grievances, but the great thing is to get them to unite.

Mr. LOVE.—Many men go into the business because there is a living in it, but knowing nothing about the requirements of a trade.

The COMMISSIONER.—I would like to get an answer to this question. At what age do workers drop out by reason of failing health or inefficiency?

Mr. STRACHAN.—So far as I am connected with the custom trade, I do not know of any tailors retiring before seventy. They are compelled to work as long as they can. That would not be the case if they had shorter hours and better wages.

The COMMISSIONER.—I ask that question because it leads to the next, that is—are there any diseases peculiar to the trade?

Mr. DAVIS.—I can answer that. Now we have the latest improvements, but it used to be before we had steam or electric power that we worked the machines with our feet. In those times, a machine operator could not exist longer than eight or nine years. Since we have the improvements, power to run the machines and so on, and have brought the establishments under the Factory Act, I do not think that we have any diseases peculiar to the trade.

The COMMISSIONER.—What about handling goods from which the fumes of the dye stuffs arise?

Mr. DAVIS.—As long as the shops are well ventilated it does not do much harm.

The COMMISSIONER.—Is your experience of the shops that they are well ventilated?

Mr. DAVIS.—We are trying our best to keep the regulations of the Factory Act. Those who do not do so are made to keep the shops in proper shape and as long as the place is right there is not much danger.

Mr. SNIDERMAN.—I am a machine operator myself. I want to say that while the foot power affected the feet and legs, electric power harms the whole body.

Mr. DAVIS.—How long did you work by foot power?

Mr. SNIDERMAN.—Until I could work no longer.

Mr. GUROFSKY.—Only a few establishments in the city have the latest machinery and even with improved machines in ten or eleven years, a good able-bodied man will be like a broken down street car horse. It does not take so long to break the girls

down. The majority of the shops in the city have no power machines and they are not well ventilated. I think the work detrimental to the health.

Mr. SNIDERMAN repeated his statement as to electric and foot power.

The COMMISSIONER.—I should surely think that power of any kind would be of advantage.

Mr. O'DONOGHUE.—(To Mr. Davis.) I would like to ask you if you are a practical workman how is it that you are in a business of this kind employing a lot of others?

Mr. DAVIS.—Because we could not get a place for work. If a man came and offered me decent wages I would drop the tailoring to-day for anything else. When I first came to the city I would never have started tailoring for myself if I could have got a fair situation. I went to a wholesaler looking for work and he told me that if I could get some machinery and help he would give me employment. That's the way I started.

Mr. GUROFSKY.—I think working gas irons detrimental to the health.

The COMMISSIONER.—Have the health officers given any statement about these gas irons?

Mr. DAVIS.—You have to watch them; if they leak they will make you sick.

The COMMISSIONER.—Does the piecework system obtain more generally among male or female employees?

Mr. SIMS.—That might apply principally to the custom tailoring. It applies all over the country in our trade. Custom work altogether done on the piecework system both by men and women.

Mr. O'DONOGHUE.—You say that in the custom trade it is nearly all by piecework. Do the men and women get the same pay for like work?

Mr. SIMS.—Far from it.

Mr. O'DONOGHUE.—In other words I might understand that if I were getting a particular style of suit made to order, a man working on it would get one price but if a woman made that same suit for the same employer and the two articles being equally well made she would not get as much for her work but I would pay the same price for the suit to the master tailor. I would not get any advantage from the lower price of the woman's labour. I understand you to say that she would not get as much.

Mr. SIMS.—Not by one-half.

The COMMISSIONER.—That is a mean kind of sweating.

Mr. SIMS.—You must understand that these women deal directly with the master tailors. They take the garments out, agreeing upon the price they are to get for them and that is generally one-half less than a man would get for the same garment.

Mr. O'DONOGHUE.—The only inference to be drawn is this—an employer would scarcely miss an opportunity of sending as much as possible of my work into the woman's hands.

Mr. SIMS.—Exactly.

The COMMISSIONER.—Do piece hands make higher or lower wages than day or week hands?

Mr. SANGSTER said that with a number of other men he had made an investigation into a case where the middleman, although paid by the piece, was paying those under him by the week. After thorough investigation they came to the conclusion that if the girls had been dealing directly with the wholesalers they could have made from one and a half to two dollars per week more than they were earning. The piece work would really be more beneficial.

Mr. GUROFSKY.—In the coat trade all piece workers get better wages than we do.

The COMMISSIONER.—Don't they work longer hours?

Mr. GUROFSKY.—No, the same hours. The shop opens and closes at the same time as ours. It is the same in the shirt trade, too.

The COMMISSIONER.—You work week work now. Do you make higher or lower wages than if you were working piece work?

Mr. GUROFSKY.—I believe that I would get better wages. There are some hands working in our shop who don't do as much work as some of the others. The good hands have to make up for the indifferent ones.

Mr. O'DONOGHUE.—It is natural that every man and woman working by the piece will work harder and harder, without keeping their health in view, for the sake of increasing their wages.

The COMMISSIONER.—Supposing that the men were working by the piece—would they not strain every nerve to run the wages up, and would not the employer, as has been said before, then begin to reduce the price paid to piece-workers?

Mr. O'DONOGHUE and OTHERS.—Yes, that's it.

Mr. O'DONOGHUE.—My experience as a workingman—and I presume that one who worked for twenty years as a printer ought to know something about it—has been this—and I think it applies to all trades: A man sets a number of people at work by the piece. They work harder than they ever did before, having nothing in their minds but how much they can put to their credit by pay-day. Dire tly the employer notices this, he says: These fellows were robbing me when I was paying them by the week. He begins to think that they "took it out of him" by not doing their best when working by the week. Then he begins to cut down the prices on various items of the work, saying: "I cannot afford to pay any more." He cuts away. The men exert themselves more than ever until, turning out more work than formerly, they again begin to earn high wages. Then the boss discovers that other prices have to be cut down, and the wages drop again.

The COMMISSIONER.—That has been the case. Is there a greater proportion of idle men in the trade now than formerly?

Mr. LOVE.—I don't know as to the wholesale trade. There is in the retail.

Mr. O'DONOGHUE.—Are you applying the question exclusively to the clothing trade? Do you want to make it apply to other trades? The carpenters here might say something.

The COMMISSIONER.—Of course. I was applying this particularly to the clothing trade. Yet any information in regard to other trades will be of benefit.

Mr. GUROFSKY.—We have got too many idle hands walking around in this city.

The COMMISSIONER.—Is there a decreased demand for labour, owing to a decreased demand for goods, or is the demand for goods as great as it was?

Mr. SIMS.—Lesser in ours—the custom trade.

Mr. LOVE.—In others more than in ours.

The COMMISSIONER.—That is, that the trade is greatly going into the wholesale.

Mr. SIMS.—Yes, passing from one into the other.

The COMMISSIONER.—Has there been an undue fostering of the apprenticeship system?—Do you know of instances where men make a practice of employing apprentices simply to get cheap labour?

Mr. LOVE.—I think that is the case.

The COMMISSIONER.—You think that is the case?

Mr. LOVE.—Yes.

Mr. GUROFSKY.—There is a man on Farley Avenue doing that kind of thing.

The COMMISSIONER.—Do employers who engage apprentices undertake to teach them the trade or a particular branch of it?

Mr. LOVE.—That is my experience, though I have had girls working for me through the whole routine. As a rule, however, the girls just learn one particular branch.

The COMMISSIONER.—Do you believe that there are men who just take apprentices in to get cheap work and then turn them out?

Mr. LOVE.—If they continue to work cheap, they don't turn them out.

The COMMISSIONER.—Are they taught the trade sufficiently as to enable them to get work at another place in another branch of the work?

Mr. LOVE.—The majority are not.

The COMMISSIONER.—Of course that is simply a swindle to take in girls and only pretend to teach them a trade.

Mr. LOVE.—You must look at it in this light. The majority just ask for work and not to learn a trade.

The COMMISSIONER.—I see frequently advertisements in the papers for apprentices for this and that trade—and I have about come to the conclusion that it is not apprentices the parties want, but simply cheap workers.

Mr. LOVE.—I believe that that is the case. If they are going to learn a trade their parents go with them to see that everything is square. But if a girl comes to us asking for work she is put to some particular branch. No trade can be learned in two or three months.

Mr. STRACHAN.—Is there such a thing in your establishment as learning a girl through two or three years until she knows the trade?

Mr. LOVE.—No.

Mr. TRIMBLE.—I have twenty or twenty-five girls working for me, and not one of them could make a coat right through.

Mr. O'DONOGHUE.—As a matter of fact is there any apprenticeship system at all?

Mr. TRIMBLE.—No. We pay just what wages we have to pay to a girl.

Mr. O'DONOGHUE.—And you let her go any time she sees fit?

Mr. TRIMBLE.—Yes.

Mr. SIMS.—In the custom trade it is a little different. The branches of the trade have girl hands. They make the pants and vest, and when a girl goes to learn the trade she learns it right through.

Mr. O'DONOGHUE.—But there is no apprenticeship system as we understand it.

Mr. SIMS.—No.

The COMMISSIONER.—There are no indentures.

Mr. SIMS.—No. There used to be an indenture system, and apprentices had to serve four years. Now that is changed.

Mr. O'DONOGHUE.—I am aware of establishments, not in your line, however, where they make a habit of advertising extensively for women and girls. The terms are—"Work three weeks for nothing, but if we find during that time that you are really of use we will pay you something. Then from that forward we pay you so much and as you improve we pay more. The result of that dodge—and I recall one particular instance—is that the establishment had the labour of from 25 to 40 girls free because they always find fault with them before the three weeks is up. In the case I particularized it was discovered and punished.

Mr. LOVE.—There is no such thing existing in the clothing trade.

Mr. GUROFSKY.—I may say that it does. I have known it to exist in the pant and clothing trade. A girl in our trade may have to work three or four years in one particular branch. If she leaves the shop she cannot strike another situation in her particular branch, and having learnt only that, cannot enter another department.

Mr. LOVE.—The wholesale trade is carried on by the departmental system.

The COMMISSIONER.—Can the girls working at the wholesale shop in the city of Toronto take any garment and finish it?

Mr. DAVIS.—You can't get one man who is a good bricklayer and stonemason combined?

Mr. O'DONOGHUE.—But a good bricklayer can do all that is connected with building so far as the builder is concerned—build a true arch—lay bricks—spread mortar and carry a hod.

Mr. SANGSTER.—That has nothing to do with the question.

Mr. GUROFSKY.—Some of these apprentices think they are going to learn the trade.

The COMMISSIONER.—Yes. I don't doubt that.

Mr. LOVE.—Not in the wholesale trade.

Mr. GUROFSKY.—Yes.

Mr. DAVIS.—A man or girl comes into an establishment and say they prefer to learn this or that branch. There is no pretense that they are going to learn a trade. I have never started a girl for nothing. She gets a dollar a week—if she is in the shop, even if she does nothing.

Mr. STRACHAN.—She won't get the dollar unless she works for it.

Mr. DAVIS.—She gets the dollar.

The COMMISSIONER.—If they are engaged by the week I should say that at the week's end they are entitled to a week's pay.

Mr. LOVE.—If they are off a day, a day's pay is taken off.

The COMMISSIONER.—I mean that if they come in and you don't have work for them that is your look out.

Mr. STRACHAN.—You see now that a multitude of girls are drawn into the business with a view to learn something which will enable them to make their livelihood. They go in with the idea that they are going to learn the trade thoroughly. But each has to take a certain position and goes from there to the machine. She leaves there in a few years perfectly helpless so far as to being able to complete any branch of the work outside of her own department. She should be able to learn, so that in two or three years she could know every department instead of as now being dependent upon one.

The COMMISSIONER.—As I understand it, the tendency of the system is the division of labour. We get experts in one particular line. If you put them through all the trade would they be experts?

Mr. GUROFSKY.—There are men in this city who have been three years in the trade and are not capable of earning \$6 per week. Girls are the same way working three years at the same thing. Advertisements frequently appear for girls to learn coat making. They go and at the end of six months if they inquire when they are going to start to learn the trade they get fired. I don't say that these gentlemen would do it.

Mr. LOVE.—As I said before, I don't think any wholesale man here takes a girl in to learn the trade. You cannot compel that to work. There is no agreement. If I take a girl as apprentice I give her \$1 per week for the first three months. It lies with herself what particular branch she will learn after that. I would not guarantee to learn them a trade.

Mr. O'DONOGHUE.—My object was—in leading this discussion—that seeing that the term apprentice had been used so often as to convey the impression that there was an apprenticeship system—and I wanted to show that there was no system as that term ought to be applied.

The COMMISSIONER.—My object was to know if there was such a thing as overloading the market with apprentices in order to cheapen labour?

Mr. LOVE.—If a girl finishes for me and there is some fault found, or she leaves, she goes somewhere else and gets work in a similar department, thus making way for another.

Mr. FEDDER.—I understand, Mr. Commissioner, that you asked if the market was overcrowded with workers.

The COMMISSIONER.—Yes, but I said—“Is it because of too many apprentices?”

Mr. FEDDER.—It is because there are too many idle working people on the market. Apprentices have also something to do with it. I want to clearly understand from these gentlemen for what purposes they are taking the apprentices on. For favour to the apprentices or to themselves? If there was more labour than labourers it would of course be all right. What has made it necessary to take these apprentices on? One gentleman says he takes an apprentice on at one dollar a week for three months and that the wholesale trade is divisional. Now it does not take three months to learn the simpler branches. When a girl stays over a month she becomes worth two dollars per week. By the end of three months she is surely worth four dollars, if she keeps to one branch. They have more experienced hands in the market knocking at the door for work, but by taking on apprentices the bosses are making money. A girl three months at one branch understands that branch as well as a girl who has been at it three years and she ought to receive the same wages.

Mr. LOVE.—I have taken on apprentices in our sense of the word who have been very good with the needle, and started them with three dollars per week. But those we refer to particularly have just left school, and the majority of them have never had a needle in their hands. Now, for a man to say that a girl just over fourteen who has never had a needle in her hand is worth three dollars per week in three months time is saying that my experience goes for nothing. The great trouble I have is to learn them to sew—to get them so broken in as to know what to do and how to do it.

Mr. FEDDER.—One branch does not take long to learn.

The COMMISSIONER.—This is merely a side issue. My point is—If there is too much labour in the market why do these men take on apprentices? I am not going to assume that these men take on apprentices for philanthropy. They are not in the business for their health.

Mr. GUROFSKY.—Yet some of them are known to swindle their hands to get cheap labour.

The COMMISSIONER.—Does it sometimes or frequently happen that there is a surplus of labour in some cities or towns and a scarcity in others?

Mr. LOVE.—I believe it does.

The COMMISSIONER.—That is, that men might be looking for work in Hamilton when there is a demand for labour in Toronto?

Mr. LOVE.—Yes.

Mr. GUROFSKY.—I know that for a positive fact. I got a letter recently from London stating that a firm wanted two hands there. I sent two men down, who were immediately taken on and are working there now.

Mr. O'DONOGHUE thought that that was another evidence that the labour bureau should be established by the Government.

The COMMISSIONER.—I may say that I have it in my mind to make a recommendation to the Government that when they put that labour bureau into operation, that a record be kept of employers who want employees in any trade, and that a record be kept and exchanged weekly by means of the post offices or customs-houses.

Mr. O'DONOGHUE.—I might state that that system prevails in the State of Ohio.

The COMMISSIONER.—And in California, too.

Mr. O'DONOGHUE.—Yes, and it has been of material advantage to the workers. It is possible that there might be frequently a demand for men in other places and a surplus here, and we would not know of it unless by chance, such as in casual mention in a private letter.

The COMMISSIONER.—If a stringent law was passed to prevent or suppress the sweating system or to control it in this province, would that have the effect of scattering the trade?

Mr. LOVE.—I think so. If such a law was passed, it should be made to apply throughout the Dominion. I have heard of men sending clothing from London and Toronto to Montreal to get the work done a little cheaper.

The COMMISSIONER.—Yes, I have heard of that. I may say that stringent laws in New York and Massachusetts have already had the effect of driving a large share of New York work to New Jersey, and Massachusetts work into Maine. I have heard it said that the enforcement of the Factory Act in this province places employees at a disadvantage as compared with other provinces.

Mr. LOVE.—I don't think so.

Mr. GUROFSKY.—I believe that it does. My boss grumbles and says that the Act is not stringently enforced in Quebec.

Mr. O'DONOGHUE.—The welfare and health of the people should be the first consideration. When the question was put to us—If we get this Act in Ontario, what will be the result in the other provinces, we said: You pass the law, and then let the courts decide whether you have the power to enforce it or not. Give an evidence of your sincerity in trying to do what is right. We believe that this is a matter that comes under trade and commerce, and, if so, the Dominion Government has a right to uphold the law.

The COMMISSIONER.—You may remember that some years ago in addressing the Manufacturers' Association, I made the statement that it would be unfortunate if it should turn out that jurisdiction did not lay with the Dominion Government, for the reason that progressive provinces would be at a disadvantage compared with non-progressive ones, and that it would operate against getting legislation tending to lessen the evils of the sweating system.

Mr. O'DONOGHUE.—I remember that. What we want some Governments to do is to go on believing that they have some power, and let the others find out if they have not.

The COMMISSIONER.—When the Factory Act was introduced into the Dominion House, I urged on the Finance Minister those views. He was doubtful where the jurisdiction lay, but I urged that we get a good Factory Act anyway. Is the present Factory Act sufficiently broad in its provisions to ensure effective inspection of shops in which clothing is made? I think from the answers to other questions that we are all agreed that it is not broad enough and that we have not enough inspectors to make it efficient.

Mr. LOVE.—I can agree with that.

The COMMISSIONER.—I think it would be better if we had more inspectors. Do workmen employed in the ordered clothing trade frequently take goods home to be there made up with the assistance of their families?

Mr. SANGSTER.—It is largely done in the custom work at the present time for this reason: there are very few employers who provide back shops or other accommodation for those employed. Where no accommodation is provided, then of course the work is taken to the homes. That is detrimental I believe not only to those but to every one in the clothing trade.

The COMMISSIONER.—In conversation with me recently, a merchant tailor took the ground that while that was true, he did not believe that tailors took advantage of their children or worked longer hours than in a shop.

Mr. STRACHAN.—If a man goes into a shop and takes work home he is told that it must be done at a certain time. He sits at home and works away until he has it finished. If the men would confine their work to ten hours a day and allow nothing to interfere with that arrangement, the surplus labour would come off the market to a great extent. But under the present system the goods are spread all over the city and those who get the chance are glad to work night and day. This reduces the season, for the season does not now last more than three weeks in the summer and the same in the winter. The rest of the time the men are largely idle, reduced to a job a week. The only fault I have with the union is that it does not restrict the hours of labour of its members so as to be an example to all labourers.

The COMMISSIONER.—When the employees take work out do they work later than they would in the shops?

Mr. STRACHAN.—The unions cannot restrict the hours where people work in their own houses.

Mr. SANGSTER.—There was a tailor last July who employed 12 or 14 hands in a back shop. For the privilege of working in that shop the hands paid him fifty to seventy-five cents per week. After a while a certain number of them did not feel inclined to go into the shop because it was not fit to go into it and they would not go into it. Then the tailor because he could not draw the full revenue for rent for the shop closed it and the people took the work to their homes.

The COMMISSIONER.—Are there any persons in the city who have no shops and yet work for manufacturers and distribute to sub-contractors?

Mr. LOVE.—I don't think so.

Mr. GUROFSKY.—There is one thing that you have not brought out. There is about the man going in and getting work from the wholesaler—at any price—opening a shop, hiring girls, getting them to work for two weeks, receive his money from the wholesaler, and then skipping out and leaving the girls in the lurch. Our suggestion was that the wholesaler should be responsible that the people who made the work were paid. He (the wholesaler) would then see that he dealt with good contractors.

The COMMISSIONER.—I must say that I don't see the way in which the remedy is to be applied. What in your opinion would be practicable?

Mr. TRIMBLE.—It could be worked if you compelled the wholesalers to make contractors put up security.

Mr. LOVE.—That would be the way.

The COMMISSIONER.—That would be no great hardship to responsible men.

Mr. LOVE.—No. It is a hard thing that girls should be robbed in that way. The wholesale men don't care who gets the work so that it is done cheap. If the manu-

facturer were responsible for those girls' wages he would be apt to look more strictly after the parties he let it out to.

Mr. O'DONOGHUE.—The conduct of one or two rascals like those we have had examples of throws disgrace upon a lot of men who are trying to do right.

Mr. LOVE.—Yes. And a security would have the tendency of keeping that class of men out. As far as my experience goes, the general body of contractors in Toronto are a respectable class of men.

The COMMISSIONER.—I have been given to understand that the carpenters have something to say to-night.

Mr. John KANE.—(Who was introduced as representing the carpenters' union.) So far as the carpentering trade is concerned there is a tendency on the part of contractors in the city of Toronto to adopt the sweating system. The carpenter employed by a sub-contractor has no possibility to make a living wage. A party last summer wanted some sheeting done. He paid by the piece. The man who worked on it the first day made 36 cents; he quit the job; the next man made 24 cents for the day and he threw it up. The work was finished on piece work by different men trying to earn a day's wages on it. There is a great deal of piece work in the trade. A contractor building a house gives the carpentering to a sub-contractor, who has it done by piecework. Men have been known to make only \$4 to \$5 per week—work hard as they will—under such circumstances when they should have earned \$5 a day. The thing is growing and cannot be put a stop to too quick. I am glad a commission has been appointed on the matter. It is an evil that should be put a stop to. We are not able to do it ourselves. We cannot cope with the manufacturers in this line.

The COMMISSIONER.—Public opinion seems to almost force the Government to get their own work done by contract.

Mr. KANE.—Even the carpentering in our Parliament Buildings was done by contract, and even the planing of the floors was done in that way. The men had to work like slaves to make a living. You will always find it that way until a radical change is made.

Mr. GUROFSKY.—Would it not be possible to prevent articles intended for wear being made in private houses?

The COMMISSIONER.—I have not lost sight of that phase by any means. There is a law now before the courts of the United States by which it is proposed to provide that the wholesaler must have a license for each man he gives out clothing to. But I don't think that it will ever become a law, although it has received the endorsement of a good many labour bodies, and that of the Convention of Factory Inspectors recently held.

Mr. O'DONOGHUE.—The intention of the license was as a safeguard in regard to sanitary conditions. By being obliged to license each person who took out work for him the wholesaler would have to get their address and inquire into the condition of their establishments. If one or two of those places were not well kept it would militate against him, and his trade would fall off because of the reports of the Government inspectors. It would attain to a great improvement in sanitary matters.

Mr. GUROFSKY.—A woman might take work to her private house—and it might be a clean one—but that is what is killing our trade.

The COMMISSIONER.—We have not got power to interfere with the rights of private individuals.

Mr. O'DONOGHUE (to Gurofsky).—Have you considered in this connection the result to honest widows who have children and who could not leave those children to go and work in places away from their homes, and who by force of circumstances are compelled to earn their own living? Your system would not be right for her.

Mr. GUROFSKY.—I should think the law should be framed for the greatest good of the greatest number.

The COMMISSIONER.—Would it be a great good to deprive an honest woman of a day's work?

Mr. O'DONOGHUE.—I sincerely hope that there will never be a law passed that will have such an effect. But I hope that there will be a law to prevent her employing other people to work for her in her house.

Mr. LOVE.—There are plenty of well-to-do married women—when I say “well to-do,” I mean women whose husbands are making good wages—who will come down to wholesale places and take out work. They want a little more money for dress and finery and compete against girls who are working for a living.

Mr. O'DONOGHUE.—That just goes to show that a measure of that kind requires careful legislation.

The Commissioner thanked the Committees of the several organizations represented for their attendance and for their assistance in eliciting information on the several branches of the subject he had been commissioned to investigate, and the meeting adjourned.